LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 23 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 1912.5 .B39 1917
Baverstock, Alban Henry,
1871-
Priesthood in liturgy and
life

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/priesthoodinlitu00bave

PRIESTHOOD IN LITURGY AND LIFE

JAN 23 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRIESTHOOD IN LITURGY AND LIFE

A Study in the mystical values of the Christian Liturgy

BY

A. H. BAVERSTOCK, M.A.

Rector of Hinton Martel, Wimborne; Author of "The Priest as Confessor," "The Supreme Adventure," "When should Children be Confirmed?" "The Unscathed Crucifix."

Christus Jesus . . . Sacerdos est ipse offerens, ipse et oblatus. Cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit ecclesiae sacrificium quae, cum ipsius Capitis corpus sit, se ipsam per ipsum discit offerre.

—St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, L. ii, c. 20.

LONDON:
Faith Press, 22, Buckingham Street, W.C.2.

1917.

PREFACE

THERE are not too many books in English on the ideals of the priestly life. And the study of these ideals is the constant need of the clergy. So far as it is a contribution to this study the present volume needs no apology, save for an inadequate treatment of a great subject. Ordinary honesty compels the author to confess that his own life in the priesthood has fallen far short of the high standard to which this book attempts to give expression. At best he can claim to have recognized this standard, set before him by better priests, and to have attempted here, however unworthily, to promote its acceptance. He would wish to take this opportunity of acknowledging his indebtedness to the Rev. G. Bayfield Roberts for much help, generously given, and for many valuable suggestions; and to the Rev. Fr. Denys, of Pershore, for his help as a theological expert in the treatment of certain theological points.

A. H. BAVERSTOCK.

HINTON MARTEL,
Feast of Our Lady's Visitation, 1917.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST 9
II. THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD 25
III. THE PREPARATION OF THE SACRISTY 37
IV. LITURGY AND LIFE 51
V. THE LITURGY OF PENANCE 62
VI. THE PENITENTIAL LIFE 74
VII. THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE 93
VIII. THE ILLUMINATED LIFE 103
IX. THE SACRIFICE OF THANKSGIVING 126
X. THE LIFE OF CHARITY 134
XI. REGULA SACERDOTIS 146

APPENDICES.

METHODS OF MENTAL PRAYER.

DEVOTIONS FOR THE DAYS OF THE WEEK AND THE MONTHS OF THE YEAR.

PRIESTHOOD IN LITURGY AND LIFE

CHAPTER I

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

Κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν.

PRIESTHOOD, while it may be predicated of humanity alone in the scale of created beings, finds its supreme expression in a Divine Person, the Son of God made Man, and made also "a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." With its correlative of sacrifice, it is revealed as belonging to the eternal order.

It is this fact that forbids crisp definition or exhaustive analysis of the conception which the term embodies. To attempt either would be to seek to contain the eternal in the earthly vessels of human language and logic and to stand convicted of an inadequate conception of an inexhaustible subject. The most the human mind can hope to do is to rise, on the basis of divine revelation and aided by the illumination of faith, to some measure of perception of a grandeur which is not of earth.

This priesthood of Christ is antitypal in relation to all priesthood before the Incarnation. The Jewish priesthood was a faint shadow of the reality already existent in the mind of God and to be revealed in Christ. The better priesthood of the new covenant finds in the priesthood of Christ not only the inspiration of its unearthly ideals and the source of its supernatural powers, but, as we shall see, its actual substance. The Christian priest is not, as was the Jewish priest, a shadow and type of the Eternal Priest: he is actually clothed with his imparted priesthood: he ministers as a priest "in Christ," by virtue of a special and supernatural union with him in his mystical body.

A study of priesthood must begin, then, with the priesthood of Christ. All the Bible has to say about priesthood finds in him its supreme fulfilment. This indeed is one of the main lessons of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its sublime insistence on the priesthood as fulfilled in him who is *Pontifex noster*, "our high priest," and on the eternity of whose priesthood such striking emphasis is laid in the words "Thou art a priest for ever," which form the keynote of whole sections.

The priesthood of Christ is eternal. This is something more than to say that it will abide for ever. It involves its existence in some sense from all eternity. In the eternal purposes of God, before ever the world was, our Lord was predestined both priest and victim. He is both "a priest for ever" and "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."[1] He is "the Lamb slain" in view of God's eternal foreknowledge of the sin which would require his atoning death. But here a question arises which is worth considering in connection with the view to be formed of priesthood. Is the office of our Lord as priest and therefore also as sacrifice or victim—for the one correlative implies the other—a consequence of God's foreknowledge of sin? Or was our Lord predestined to this office independently of sin? Had there been no sin, would he still have been our priest?

The answer to this question really turns on the answer to another, more commonly asked, whether, that is, the Incarnation was solely a remedy for sin, an event which would not have taken place but for the Fall, or whether it was part of God's original purpose in creation, apart from sin. This latter question St. Thomas Aquinas discusses in his *Summa* at some length.[1] He admits that theologians answer variously, but himself inclines to the view that apart from sin there would have been no Incarnation. He quotes the words from the blessing of the paschal candle: *O felix culpa, quae talem ac tantum meruit habere redemptorem!* in support of his opinion. The great name of St. Thomas has settled many vexed questions of theology, and had the Church adopted his view on this point we should be compelled to conclude that the priesthood, like the Incarnation, was merely a consequence of sin, and that the ideas with which the existence of sin has coloured it were necessary to it. For priesthood necessarily belongs to humanity, and if our Lord had not become Man he could not have been our Priest. But, as a matter of fact, the opposite view, associated with the name of Duns Scotus, has not only held its own but actually gained ground among theologians, in the teeth of St. Thomas's conclusion. The view which regards the Incarnation as the climax of Creation, and man, the crown of creation, made in God's image, as destined for that special union with God which only the Incarnation could effect, is so inherently convincing that few theologians now bring themselves to reject it and reduce so sublime a manifestation of the Wisdom and Love of God as the Incarnation to the level of a mere consequence of the Fall.[2]

---

[1] Rev. xiii. 8. It should be pointed out that this passage does not necessarily involve a reference to the Antecedent Will of God ordaining the Sacrifice of Calvary for the sin which he foreknew. Many commentators, including St. Ambrose and St. Anselm, take it to be a reference to the death of Christ in type and shadow from the sacrifice of Abel onwards, although others make "from the foundation of the world"="from all eternity." Needless to say, the truth of our Lord's predestination as the Saving Victim does not rest on the rendering of a single text.

---

[1] *Pars Tertia*, Q.I. Art. iii: *Utrum, si non fuisset peccatum, Deus incarnatus fuisset.*

[2] Dr. Westcott, in his Essay on *The Gospel of Creation* (Epistles of St. John, pp. 268 sqq.) expresses his adherence to the Scotist view in the following words: "All our present ideas of human life necessarily involve thoughts of pain and suffering and weakness. Such thoughts are wholly excluded from the conception of that Manhood which we regard as predestined in the eternal and absolute counsel of God for union with the Word, or (to look at it from the other side) as answering to Him of whom it was, in some sense which we cannot strictly define, the image, related as a copy to the archetype. We follow this progress to its consummation; and then, having so gained a conception of manhood answering to what is made known of the Divine idea of man, we go on to say that it is most consonant to what God has revealed to believe that it was His pleasure that humanity, so consummated in its proper development in many parts, should find

Indeed the earliest Christian theology seems to make for the Scotist view as most fully satisfying the implications of divine revelation. For, from St. Paul onwards, Christian doctors have made much of the connection between the first Adam and the second. The first man, made in the image of God, is constantly regarded as the prototype and promise of him who, made Man, is "the express image of his Person."[1] Moreover, as early as Lactantius,[2] in the beginning of the fourth century, we find the thought of Adam as the priest of creation. The world was God's temple, and he set man in it to be his priest ; man, linked to the material world by his body and to the spiritual order by his soul, and so able to offer to God on behalf of creation a more complete worship than was possible to any other being.[3] And this thought, involved in the constitution of man as revealed to us, and in the familiar conception that God made the world for man and man for himself, seems to strengthen considerably the case for the larger view of the Incarnation, as not merely correcting the Fall, but completing the original purpose of creation. For Adam as the first priest becomes the shadow and promise of the Eternal Priest. Moreover, it reveals priesthood and sacrifice as prior to sin and death, and establishes the truth that a death atoning for sin is incidental to them, owing to the Fall, and not of their

---

its true personality by union with His Son. According to this view, man's self-will by which he fell was not the occasion of the supreme manifestation of the Love of God in '*the taking of the manhood into God.*' That was the end of Creation from the beginning. The Fall, and here lies the greatest mystery of divine love, did not frustrate this end." Westcott maintains that this view is consistent with the general tenor of Greek Theology. It is hardly too much to say that the Thomist view reflects the Aristotelianism which in St. Thomas's day, and for long after, dominated western theology. The Platonist idealism which had so large an influence in earlier theology, not excluding that of St. Paul, became for a time unfashionable. But it was bound to come to its own again, and to correct a great deal in mediæval theology. Dr. Westcott is a good instance of the Platonist outlook.

[1] Heb. i. 3.

[2] *De Ira Dei*, c. 14: *Sequitur ut ostendam, cur hominem fecerit Deus. Sicut mundum propter hominem machinatus est ita ipsum propter se, tamquam divini templi antistitem.*

But the idea is far older than Lactantius, being found in the writings of Philo Judaeus (*De monarchia*), and therefore probably familiar to St. Paul. Plutarch also ascribes it to Diogenes.

[3] So Plato called man "the horizon of the universe," as being the meeting point of the material and spiritual orders.

original essence. Sacrifice in its essence is the presenting to God an acceptable offering: the priest is essentially one who makes such an offering. Because sin has entered the world, sacrifice involves the thought of pain and death: the Godward energies of the priest are against the stream of a fallen order. The bloodless sacrifice which offers to God the fruits of an earth which has fallen under the curse is rejected, and the sacrifice of Abel, the martyr priest, marks a new order of typical sacrifice and priesthood. The essential function of the priest is that *constitutus ex hominibus*, "taken from among men," he ministers *ad deum*. Incidentally this involves the offering of "gifts and sacrifices for sin,"[1] involves pain and death.

Let us apply this essential conception of priesthood and sacrifice to the life of our great High Priest.

He came into the world as a Priest, and from the first moment he exercised his priesthood. It is important to insist upon this, in view of the marked tendency of modern Christian thought to dwell on the manward aspect of the life of our Lord, while its primary character as a life lived for God and to him is largely lost sight of. It is true, of course, that our Lord was made man, and lived, laboured, and died "for us men, and for our salvation." But it is not the whole truth, nor the most important aspect of it. The Saviour's own summary of his life is to be found in the words, "Father, I have glorified thee on the earth."[2] He who taught his followers to make it their first prayer that they might hallow God's name certainly set this before him as the supreme object of his incarnate life. To forget this—to represent our Lord's ministry as primarily a ministry to man—is to degrade, as Protestantism actually has done, the whole conception of religion, by humanizing it. It is to invert the true order, so that in the last resort God comes to exist for man instead of man for God. The Church becomes an institution for man's convenience, instead of a spiritual temple for God's worship: the prophet, preaching to man, supersedes the priest, ministering to God; sacrifice becomes an obsolete idea, the mass merely a communion; and religion is regarded no longer as a call to God's service, but solely as the satisfaction of man's need.

---

[1] Heb. v. 1.

[2] John xvii. 4.

We must insist, then, on what we may call the liturgical character of the life of Christ. He was throughout, as it were, a priest at the altar. His whole life was a mass, with the introit, "Lo I come to do thy will, O God."[1] As a priest at the altar reads from the book before him his appointed service, and performs it by word and gesture, so our great High Priest from the moment of his coming into the world kept his regard steadily upon "the volume of the book," the eternal purposes of God revealed to him, and translated them into action in the thoughts and words and works of his life on earth. In this life there was nothing at haphazard, nothing irrational, nothing imperfect. Against the stream of a fallen world he set his human will in accord with the divine will. This will he saw clearly and interpreted faithfully. All he said and did was the perfect translation of God's will into human speech and action: perfect not only outwardly, in that he said and did as the Father appointed, but perfect also inwardly, so that his human mind and heart reflected the divine purpose. This is the secret of the utter perfection of the *Vita vitae nostrae*, and it is too often missed. We make a great mistake when we conceive of our Lord's priesthood as exercised only, or mainly, in his sacrificial death. It was exercised from the first breath he drew in his mother's womb. Because he came into a fallen order, it was at every point a contradiction of that order. In a world averted from God, his Godward regard spelt from the first resistance, labour, suffering: and the life which was a death to the world culminated, naturally and necessarily, in the death of Calvary, as the supreme exercise of his priesthood. The whole ministry, and every activity of it, his words and actions no less than his sufferings, his life no less than his death, and, after his death, his resurrection and ascension and the activities of his priesthood in heaven and earth, all these alike are a ministry to God for man. "Taken from among men," he functions throughout towards God as the representative of humanity: each and every act of his is an offering of "gifts and sacrifices" which avail for man as offered on man's behalf and by humanity in him as its representative.

---

[1] Heb. x. 5–9.

From this view of our Lord's life as liturgical, certain consequences emerge, of the greatest importance in estimating the character of priesthood, and of the greatest practical value.

The first thing to be noticed is that the priesthood of Christ, as involving a special relation to God, is the consequence of a divine grant. Humanity, created by God, cannot of itself assume a special relation towards him. Only by the divine favour can man draw near to him in the priesthood. And therefore it is of the essence of priesthood that it should be conferred by a divine act. Hence, although the priesthood of our Lord was borne by a divine Person, the Person of the Eternal Word, yet the humanity which he took required a divine designation to this office, a divine act to initiate its special relation to God. This is insisted on in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son,[1] to-day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."[2] Here is the divine designation. So again our Lord is spoken of as "made" a priest, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless (ἀκαταλύτου) life."[1] Here is the divine grant of the priesthood, more precisely indicated as an "anointing of the Holy Ghost," in virtue of which he receives the title of Christ, *i.e.*, "the Anointed."

---

[1] Commentators see here a reference to the custom of patriarchal times, when the priesthood went to the firstborn: cp. Rom. viii. 29, "The firstborn among many brethren."

[2] Heb. v. 4–6.

But priesthood, exercised in a life of liturgy, postulates more than the divine admission to a special status. The priest must know his mass, or at least must have the knowledge to read it. Without such knowledge he cannot perform his function. We must add, then, to the special status divinely given, a special illumination from God, as essential to the exercise of priesthood. Our great High Priest exercised, and could only exercise, his priesthood in the light of a perfect knowledge of the divine will. "He himself knew what he would do."[2] And this knowledge was bound to be, not the omniscience which was the inalienable prerogative of his divine nature, but a knowledge exercised by his humanity, since only in virtue of his humanity could he be a priest. And to knowledge we must add power. The notion of power seems inseparable from the idea of priesthood, and receives especial emphasis where priesthood is exercised in a world averted from God and involves a force to go counter to its forces. This power again, as required for the exercise of his priesthood, was bestowed upon his humanity. It is not the omnipotence which is inalienably his as God: it is expressly spoken of as being "given" him, and as a fruit of his anointing.[3] And it is significant in this connection that he claimed to have "power on earth" as "the Son of Man."[4] This should guard us from the somewhat crude view which has accounted for his miracles as manifestations of the power of his Godhead. They were indeed manifestations of a divine power, but it was a power bestowed upon his manhood by the divine act, anointing him "with the Holy Ghost and with power."[5]

[1] Heb. vii. 15, 16.

[2] John vi. 6.

[3] John xvii. 2, Matt. xxviii. 18.

[4] Matt. ix. 6, etc.

[5] Acts x. 38.

A special illumination, a special power. It will not have escaped notice that precisely these two gifts are involved in the office of Prophet and the office of King which are Christ's, together with the office of Priest, by the anointing of the Holy Ghost. It follows, surely, that we should regard the prophetic office, the priesthood and the royalty with which our Lord was invested, not so much as three offices, separable one from another, held by a single Person, but rather as one threefold office. It is true that the three are separable in thought. It is true again that in the types which foreshadowed our Lord they are held by distinct persons. Yet even in the types they are sometimes combined and almost always overlap. There were priests who were prophets, as Samuel and others after him. The greatest of the prophets, Moses, seems to assume the character of a priest when he holds up his hands in intercession for Israel at Rephidim: the priest no less than the prophet is required to have a special knowledge of God. David is both king and prophet, and the prophets are revealed in many instances as gifted with a special power in addition to their special illumination. It is significant that the type of all others selected by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as symbolizing the Eternal Priest is the priest-king, Melchisedec. And, to revert to the earliest type of all, Adam, the priest of creation, is also its king,[1] and is gifted with the special knowledge which marks the prophet.[2] All alike, the special status in relation to God, the power over creation, and the special illumination, were a divine gift, inherent in the special grace which constituted his original righteousness, and were impaired by the Fall.

The Old Testament, then, suggests a connection of the priesthood with prophetic illumination and kingly power. The New Testament finally establishes it. Our Lord was, by the anointing of the Holy Ghost, Prophet, Priest, and King. The seven gifts with which he was anointed "without measure"[1] were gifts which both illumined and empowered,[2] and thus wove the threefold office into one gift. And, finally, priesthood as revealed in the New Testament is a "royal priesthood,"[3] constituting those who hold it "priests and kings."[4] Moreover, it is joined with the prophetic office: the priest is also a preacher of the Gospel. Illumination and power are thus seen to be of the essence of true priesthood.

---

[1] Homo factus est a Deo rector et princeps omnium animalium, totiusque mundi quasi rex. Cornelius a Lapide, on Genesis i.

[2] Adam congrua singulis animantibus nomina imposuit: unde elucet summa ejus scientia et sapientia . . . Deus dono prophetiae hominem insignivit, cum dixit: *Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis.* Ibidem.

Before we pass on from this point, it is worth while to draw the corollary that the perfection of Christ's priesthood is concerned in modern theories which impute to him some degree of ignorance, and ignorance on really vital matters which concerned his message and his conduct. Such theories are based on the mistaken assumption that the ignorance normal to fallen man is proper to humanity as such. Those who propound them seem to forget that the wound of ignorance in the human mind is one of the effects of the Fall. And they overlook the vital necessity to the perfection of our Lord's priesthood of a perfect knowledge of the will of God guiding and informing his words and actions in every detail. The gift of counsel, bestowed even upon fallen man to enable him to discern the will of God concerning him, but given to each "by measure,"[5] was bestowed in all its fulness and perfection upon Christ. Those who have hazarded the dangerous and dishonouring theories alluded to have not always been well acquainted with the teachings of an older and saner theology. This theology distinguishes carefully between the uncreated omniscience which belonged to the divine nature of the Word and the created knowledge belonging to his human soul, a knowledge which was threefold, consisting of

---

[1] John iii. 34.
[2] Isa. xi. 1–3.
[3] 1 Pet. ii. 9.
[4] Rev. i. 6.
[5] Rom. xii. 3, and cp. John iii. 34.

(1) the *beatific* knowledge enjoyed by the sacred humanity as a consequence of the vision of God, (2) the *infused* knowledge directly given by the action of grace upon the mind, and (3) the *acquired* knowledge which he deigned to gain by ordinary human means.[1]

We pass to a further question which arises from the consideration of our Lord's whole life as priestly and liturgical. A priest is one who offers sacrifice, offers a victim. In the supreme expression of priesthood, in the liturgical life of Christ, the Priest is also the Victim. Throughout his life, as in his death, he offers himself. Plainly it is of importance to ask whether, here again, we have two separate offices united in one Person, or whether we are to regard the offices as really inseparable. In other words, is self-oblation of the essence of priesthood as revealed in Christ?

The Old Testament sacrifices seem at first sight to suggest the separateness of priest and sacrifice. Throughout, the priest offers a victim which is not himself. The priest typified Christ as the Priest to come; the victim also typified Christ as the saving Victim to come. But the priest-types and the victim-types are two separate series, pointing to the ideal Priest and the ideal Victim, but finally finding fulfilment in one Person. A closer study, however, of the origin and development of sacrifice suggests an identity of a kind between priest and victim, an identity which foreshadowed the truth to be clearly manifested in the supreme expression of priesthood, namely, that the priest must also be the victim, that he must offer himself. To see that this is so, let us go back to the origin of sacrifice, to the first offering of a victim to God. The divine institution of sacrifice after the Fall is probably to be found in the clothing of our first parents with the skins of beasts.[2] This involved the beginning of death, the penalty incurred by sin. God pardoned man upon his repentance and promised him ultimate salvation through

---

[1] Vid. St. Thomas, *Summa*, Pars Tertia, Q. ix, *De scientia Christi.*

[2] Gen. iii. 21.

One who should come. But the penalty of death meanwhile was to be paid, and paid immediately. And it was paid by the first victims, dying instead of man, while he was clothed in their skins as if to identify himself the sinner with the victim for sin substituted for him. And throughout the early history of sacrifice the idea that the sacrificer offered the life of the victim for his own life, forfeit to God, the idea that he, in some sense, died in the victim, is certainly prominent.

A writer on Indo-Aryan traditions of sacrifice has pointed out that "the mystical identification of the sacrificer with the victim, which is the ransom for sin," forms a "prominent idea in the Vedas,"[1] and he affords abundant illustrations in support of his statement. Under the Sinaitic covenant this same mystical identification of offerer and victim is expressed by a significant ceremony forming part of the ritual of every sacrifice. This was the laying on of hands, by which the offerer made the victim his substitute, confessing his sin if it were a sin-offering, and symbolically identifying himself with it.[2] He offered its life for his own, recognized as forfeit. The same ritual was observed in the case of the blasphemer, condemned to death for his blasphemy.[3] All who had heard him were to lay their hands upon him before he was stoned by the congregation. They had in a measure shared his sin: they were to identify themselves symbolically with him in his punishment.

Moreover a special identification of the priest with the victim is surely to be found in the constant insistence on his sanctification, placing him, like the victims he offered, in the category of that which was "holy to the Lord."[4] Elect of God, elect of the elect, since God chose him out of the chosen race, God's possession in a peculiar sense,[1] the priest was sanctified, separated from the people even as the sacrifice was separated from the flock and sanctified. Only as one himself offered to God was he permitted to draw near to him to whom sacrifice was offered. And in the characteristic sacrifice of his consecration he not only laid his hands upon the victim, the ram of consecration, thus identifying himself with it, but was anointed with its blood, on ear and hand and foot, as if still further to associate priest and victim.

---

[1] Rev. K. M. Banerjea, quoted in Willis, *Worship of the Old Covenant*, p. 237.

[2] Lev. i.–iii. passim.

[3] Lev. xxiv. 14.

[4] Lev. xxi. 6; and cp. vi. 25, vii. 1, xxvii. 28, etc.

It may be urged that the Christian priesthood leaves behind this identity of priest and victim, foreshadowed in the old types and fulfilled in Christ, since the offering of the Christian priest is not himself but Christ, the "only victim we can plead," "the New Law's new oblation." But a little reflection will prove otherwise. For the priest who offers is united, not merely symbolically, as of old, to the victim he offers, but actually, as a member of his body mystical. Not only is he united to Christ the Priest, in virtue of his priesthood imparted to him. He is also united to Christ the Victim, to suffer with him, to offer himself with him. The One Bread which he offers is indeed Christ: no less oblation could avail. But the faithful are offered in and with Christ, and the priest among them. "We being many are one bread and one body."[2] Hence, with the offering of the Lamb of God, we offer "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice." Under the new covenant as under the old, self-oblation remains of the essence of priesthood.

A third point which we may profitably consider is the relation of our Lord as Priest, throughout his whole life, to man for whom he exercised his priesthood. For, if it is vital to insist first on the primary relation of the priest *ad Deum*, as exercising the energies of priesthood towards God, ministering to him, it is important not to overlook his relation to man, as *constitutus ex hominibus*, and ministering for them. The priest stands before God as the representative of others who worship with him and through him.[1] It is not enough to say that he worships as their substitute, performing on their behalf a service which they are excused from rendering, except so far as they render it through him. He is necessary to their worship, as presenting it to God. But they too worship, with him and through him. Behind the priest at the altar is the worshipping congregation, associating themselves with him as their representative. Hence it is that our Lord, as a necessary consequence of his priesthood, was throughout his life doing penance. Himself sinless, he represented before God a humanity which was sinful. And throughout God accepted him as the representative of this sinful humanity. Every thought, every word, and every action of his, throughout his life of liturgy, had an infinite value of reparation for the sins of thought, word, and deed, committed by those whom he represented. And this by his own deliberate intention, as he set his will to do the will of God. It will be seen at once that this relation of the priest to those for whom he ministers postulates a priestly character in them. They have a share in his priestly energies, since he ministers for them and they worship through him. This is emphasized in the typical worship of the old covenant. Behind the priest, offering sacrifice on behalf of the people, stand the people, associating themselves with him in the sacrifice which is offered for them, making his worship their own. And they are, in virtue of this association, a nation of priests.[1] The "breastplate of judgment," with its twelve precious stones, engraved with the names of the twelve tribes, worn by the high priest when he went into the holy place,[2] emphasized this association. Priesthood thus involves in its essence the conception of a body of humanity for whom it is exercised, associated with the priest in his function, and itself priestly in virtue of this association. Throughout his ministry our Lord appears before God as the head and leader of a body. This is insisted upon in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee . . . And again, Behold I and the children which the Lord hath given me."[3]

---

[1] cp. Num. xvi. 5: "Even to-morrow the Lord will shew who are his; and will cause him to come near unto him: even him whom he hath chosen will he cause to come near unto him."

[2] 1 Cor. x. 17.

---

[1] It must not, however, be supposed that the priest is nothing more than the representative of those from whom he is taken and for whom he ministers. We need to be on our guard against a minimizing view of the Christian priesthood which regards it as a mere official and active exercise of powers latent in the Christian laity. It must be insisted that the Christian priest receives in ordination by a divine gift *from above* what could not be given him from below, a *sacerdotium* distinct from the priesthood of the laity. It is this that constitutes him not only the representative of the people, but the representative of Christ.

The priesthood of Christ is thus seen to involve the doctrine of the Church. Our Lord is a priest offering for humanity, but in a special sense for those who are especially united to him. Not only did he take our humanity that he might be our Priest: we also were grafted on to him, united to him as members of his body, that he might be more than ever our Priest. The Head lived, laboured, suffered and died, exercising his priesthood throughout for the body. But the body was represented by the Head in all: the worship he offered was offered for his members; and they, too, sharing in his priestly energies, are, in a sense, priests.

The unity of Christ with his Church solves the difficulties created by crude and unbalanced theories of substitution. That Christ was substituted for us and drew near to God when we could not, is true. But it needs the complementary truth that we also drew near to God in him. In a sense we suffered in him, and suffer in him still. The Church fills up "that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ."[4] Christ pleased the Father, not that we might be dispensed from pleasing him, but that we might be reconciled in him: he bore the penalty for sin, not that we might bear no penalty, but that we might share his. Our union with him involves a share in his priesthood. He was our Representative, not as representing those apart from him, but in virtue of our substantial union with him. Hence the priesthood of Christ leads us to the priesthood of the Christian Church. This priesthood, as belonging in some sense to the whole body of the faithful, and as bestowed in a special and exclusive sense upon those whom we call priests, must next form the object of our consideration.

---

[1] Exod. xix. 6.
[2] Exod. xxviii. 29.
[3] Heb. ii. 11–13.
[4] Col. i. 24.

CHAPTER II

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD

Ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον

OUR great High Priest has, as the very title implies, others associated with him in his priesthood. "He is the head of the body, the Church."[1] This body, united to him by the Holy Ghost, is a priestly body, worshipping God through him. Every member of the Church is therefore, in a true sense, a priest. But we must beware of the error of supposing that the ministerial priesthood is nothing more than the authoritative expression, limited in its exercise to an official class, of priestly powers inherent in the whole body. Over and above the priesthood of each member of the Christian Church there is the priesthood, properly so called, which is given to a special class, in its plenitude to bishops, in a less degree to priests, and exclusively conferred upon these two orders alone. This priesthood, on which the characteristic worship of the new covenant depends, is the glory of the Catholic Church, and essential to her existence. And it is necessary to insist jealously upon its character as a special gift of God bestowed upon men especially called to this office and consecrated to it by a peculiar grace of the Holy Ghost.

There is an exact parallel to be drawn in this connexion between the typical priesthood of the old covenant and its antitype under the new covenant. In both alike there is a priesthood, related to the Priesthood of Christ. The high priest, the supreme embodiment of earthly priesthood, was, in a unique sense corresponding to his unique office, a type of Christ. Associated with the high priest and subordinate to him were the priests, each of them, as the offerer of sacrifice, a type of Christ. The Levites were associated with the priests in virtue of certain duties which they alone were privileged to perform in connexion with the worship of the sanctuary. But, great as were their privileges in comparison with those of the ordinary Israelite, they were not priests and might not without impiety usurp distinctively priestly offices.[1] Finally, the whole Jewish people constituted a priestly nation, with the privilege of drawing near to God through the covenant worship of sacrifice. For this exercise of their priesthood they were, however, dependent upon the priests properly so called, who were separated from them by the fact of their consecration, as really as they were themselves separated by the divine election from other nations. Without the priest no Jew could offer sacrifice to God.

---

[1] Col. i. 18.

It is the characteristic of the Christian Church, as distinguished from the Jewish, that she sets up her altars and offers her sacrifice "in every place,"[2] and, consequently, reproduces in every place her hierarchy. A unity throughout the world, she reproduces the unity of the whole in each diocese as a unit. The bishop, like the high priest at Jerusalem, is the supreme embodiment of the priesthood on earth. The priests, properly so called, are associated with him in his priesthood. He and they alone may perform distinctively priestly functions. Deacons correspond to the Levites of the old covenant, and have been called by this name from very early times. Like the Levites, they are forbidden to usurp the special privileges of the priesthood. Finally, all the baptized form "a royal priesthood,"[3] as the Jewish nation formed "a kingdom of priests."[4] For they, too, have their part in offering at the altars of the Church the Christian sacrifice. They, too, are dependent for this offering upon the order of the priesthood, set apart from them by a special vocation and a special endowment, by consecration, with distinct powers. Without them they cannot offer the characteristic sacrifice of the new covenant.

---

[1] Num. xvi. 9, 10. [2] Mal. i. 11. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 9. [4] Exod. xix. 6.

The parallel is as complete as the difference is striking. The priesthood of the old covenant was a shadow and type of the "better thing" which God has "provided" in Christ.[1] The Church has the substance of which Judaism had the shadow. Theirs was a reflected, ours is an imparted, priesthood, both alike being related to and derived from the eternal priesthood of Christ. This is indeed true of all priesthood, right back to the original priesthood of Adam. There is not, nor ever has been, approach to God save through Christ, who is the Way. All priesthood that could promise such approach must be, in the last resort, his priesthood. There has never been, can never be, other than one priesthood, shared typically by the priests of older dispensations, shared substantially by the priests of the Christian dispensation.

This parallel, moreover, can be established by the explicit testimony of holy Scripture. The Old Testament not only prophesies the "pure oblation"[2] to be offered by the Gentiles: it contains also the divine prediction, "I will take of them (*i.e.*, the Gentiles) for priests and for Levites."[3] And the New Testament witnesses clearly to the fulfilment of these prophecies. The "pure oblation" is the body of Christ, offered in the Eucharist. Such has been the teaching of the Church from the first.[4] The conception of sacrifice is embedded in the New Testament accounts of the institution of the Eucharist, and cannot be explained away without doing very considerable violence to their interpretation. It has been said that the New Testament "is throughout *written in cypher*, and the key to that cypher is to be found in the old sacrificial economy."[1] Of no part of the New Testament is this so conspicuously true as of the accounts of the institution of the holy Eucharist. Distinctively sacrificial terms, implying sacrificial references,[2] were used by our Lord; and one might as well deny that the Passover was a sacrifice as seek to explain away the sacrificial character of the transaction which was substituted for it.

---

[1] Heb. xi. 40.

[2] Mal. i. 11.

[3] Isa. lxvi. 21.

[4] e.g., the prophecy of Malachi is taken as a reference to the Eucharist by Justin Martyr and St. Irenaeus, in the second century, as well as by St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Chrysostom in the fourth century, and by the fathers and commentators generally from that time onward.

And the institution of a Christian sacrifice necessarily involves the institution of a Christian priesthood, parallel with the priesthood of the old covenant, empowered to offer that sacrifice. It is not here a question of names. Those who offer sacrifice are priests, by whatever name they might be called to distinguish them from the priests of the Jewish and heathen systems which the earliest Christianity found established. Of the existence, by the appointment of our Lord himself, of a body of men as definitely set apart from the main body of believers as the Jewish priests were from the rest of the nation, we have abundant and explicit testimony. At its very beginning the Church consists of members and ministers, the latter enjoying a position of superiority and privilege in relation to the former. It is a school with disciples set to learn, and apostles sent to teach; a fold with the "sheep of the pasture," and shepherds, pastors, set to feed and guide them; a household of God's servants, with stewards appointed over them, to give them their meat in due season; a kingdom, with subjects and rulers set over them, rulers whom they are to obey.[3] All these images, familiar to readers of the New Testament, emphasize the privileged position of the Christian ministry, and its character as divinely empowered by the author of Christianity. They represent the Church mainly in its manward activities. But the Church exists primarily for the service of God. It is a body of worshippers, offering to God a pure oblation, and with priests chosen out of the congregation to offer. In the measure in which the service of God exceeds the service of man, the priesthood is the supreme privilege of the Christian ministry, the offering of sacrifice their highest office. And this priesthood differentiates the priest from the congregation as the shepherd is differentiated from the flock, the ruler from the subjects.

---

[1] Archdeacon Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. II, pt. ii, p. 8.

[2] e.g., to Exod. xxiv. 8; Lev. xvii. 11, etc.

[3] Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

And the priesthood of the Christian ministry, no less than its pastorate, no less than its power of rule, is involved in the words of the divine commission: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."[1] He who was sent by the Father to be the Shepherd, the Teacher, the Ruler, and the Priest of his people, gives to his first ministers authority to exercise and to convey to others a like office.[2]

We need not trace this Apostolic ministry through its development, already seen in its opening stages in the New Testament, into the Catholic hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons. The commission to the Apostles provided for the continuance of a ministry divinely empowered, perpetuating a succession of priests. And the statement of our ordinal, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," is abundantly justified. But it is not the purpose of this volume to sketch the history of the priesthood. Its aim is rather to give a clear view of priesthood as it exists and of the theology on which it rests, as a basis for the ideals which the Christian priest should set before him. We have shown that our Lord ordained a priesthood, separated from the body of believers and distinguished from them by powers parallel to those which distinguished the Jewish priest from the rest of the chosen nation. It remains to examine more closely this differentiated priesthood.

---

[1] John xxi. 20, and cp. xvii. 18.

[2] See additional note at end of chapter.

As the Jewish priest was set apart and consecrated for his office, so the Christian priest is set apart and consecrated by his ordination to the priesthood.

The greatness of the privileges conferred upon the layman can scarcely be exaggerated. The privileges of the Jew are emphasized in holy Scripture: those of the Christian are inconceivably greater. "Baptized into Christ,"[1] he has been made "a new creature,"[2] lifted out of a fallen race into a new humanity. He is substantially united to Christ, and, in virtue of this union, a "partaker of the divine nature."[3] His character is priestly, because he is a "member" of Christ in "the Church which is his body."[4] Washed in his blood, as the priests of old washed in the laver before approaching the sanctuary, Christians are made "kings and priests unto God."[5] The status of the Christian is both royal and priestly. He is a King's son: he is united to the Eternal Priest. But his royalty is not that of those set to bear rule in the Church. In relation to them he is a subject, pledged to submit to their authority. And his priestly character does not invest him with the priesthood of the Christian ministry: he is a layman and not, in the full and proper sense of the word, a priest. He is dependent on the ministry of priests as he is subject to the authority of rulers.

Great as are the privileges of the Christian layman, those of the priest are far greater. The one is separated from a fallen race and made the child of God: the other is separated from the congregation of the faithful and made the minister of Christ.[6] Clothed by the Holy Ghost with the imparted priesthood of Christ, he is authorized and empowered to minister as his representative to God and man. He *impersonates* Christ.[1] *In persona Christi* the priests of the Church minister to men: Christ is the good Shepherd, and they are pastors. *In persona Christi* they minister to God[2]: Christ is the High Priest, and they are priests.

---

[1] Gal. iii. 27.

[2] 2 Cor. v. 17.

[3] 2 Pet. i. 4.

[4] Ephes. i. 22, 23.

[5] Rev. i. 5, 6.

[6] 1 Cor. iv. 1.

There is, in fact, no greater dignity in the Church on earth than that of the priesthood. There are, it is true, degrees of dignity in the priesthood. The bishop is admitted to the *summum sacerdotium* as distinguished from the *inferius sacerdotium* of the ordinary priest. The priesthood involves a twofold power over the body of Christ: over his body in the sacrament, and over his mystical body, the Church. The former power, by which the priest consecrates the Eucharist, is common to all priests. The power over the Church, including the gift of the keys, the power to absolve, and the power of spiritual rule, is greater in the case of the bishop. Besides having greater powers of government, he alone has the authority to ordain others to the ministry. Hence the saying of St. Epiphanius, that bishops beget fathers in the Church; priests can only beget sons.[3]

Jeremy Taylor's celebrated charge to the clergy of his diocese, *The Whole Duty of the Clergy*, contains a striking passage on the dignity of the Christian priest as "separated yet again." He admits the priestly character of the Christian people. "The whole Church hath a share in the power of spiritual sacrifice: 'ye are a royal priesthood,' 'kings and priests unto God'; that is, so ye are priests as ye are kings." But he is careful to add that kings and priests "have a glory conveyed to them, of which the people partake but in minority, and allegory and improper communication. . . . To you, I say, of the clergy, these things are spoken properly; to you these powers are conveyed really; upon you God hath poured his Spirit plentifully; you are the choicest of his choice, the elect of his election, a church picked out of the church, vessels of honour for your Master's use, appointed to teach others, authorized to bless in his name: you are the ministers of Christ's priesthood, under-labourers in the great work of mediation and intercession, *medii inter Deum et populum*, you are 'for the people towards God'[1] and convey answers and messages from God to the people."[2]

---

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 10.

[2] *Sacerdos in offerendo gerit personam Christi in Ecclesia, qui se Patri pro nobis obtulit.* St. Thomas, *Summa*, Pars III, Supp. Q. XL, Art. iii.

[3] *Episcoporum ordo patrum generator est: patres enim generat Ecclesiae: Presbyterorum vero non potens generare patres, per lavacri regenerationem generat filios Ecclesiae. Haer.* 75.

And this Christian priesthood satisfies the essential conditions of priesthood which we have already deduced from a consideration of the supreme priesthood of Christ. It is related to the priesthood of Christ; for it is that priesthood, imparted by a sacrament of Christ's appointment to those whom he has chosen. The words of our Lord to the Apostles, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you and ordained you,"[3] are applicable to every priest. For the vocation to the priesthood, necessary as it is, does not make the priest. Moreover, this vocation is itself a divine gift albeit requiring human correspondence with it.

It follows that, like the priesthood of Christ, the Christian priesthood is a divine gift. Christ himself, the Head of the Church, present, according to his promise, with the successors of the Apostles to the end of the world,[4] bestows it through them by the operation of the Holy Ghost. "No man taketh this honour unto himself."[5] And this priesthood is both royal and prophetic: it involves a grant of divine power and divine illumination. The priest is given a grace which enables him, in the measure in which he corresponds with it, to perform aright the duties of his office. St. Thomas teaches that in the Sacrament of Holy Order the sevenfold gift of the Holy Ghost, given to all Christians in Confirmation, is imparted for the special purpose of their office.[1] These seven gifts are supernatural habits of the soul, informing the energies of mind and will and heart. Four of them, Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, and Knowledge, are intellectual, and constitute a special illumination. Wisdom, the gift which has produced in the Church the great masters of the spiritual life, enables the priest who cultivates it to order his own life and to guide others in the practice of Christian ascetics. Understanding illumines him with the knowledge of Christian dogma, so necessary to his teaching office. Counsel guarantees him an unfailing guidance in the choice of actions, and enables him to advise others. Knowledge helps him to gain the knowledge of his own craft, to equip himself for the efficient discharge of his duties. The central gift of Ghostly Strength, or Fortitude, reinforces the energies of the will, imbuing it with the martyr spirit which is courageous to resist the influences of the world, the promptings of a corrupt flesh, and the activities of evil spirits; to mortify self and endure persecution. Piety and Holy Fear, acting upon the affections, give the priest a special assistance of grace in the cultivation of that spirit of tender devotion and of reverence which are so especially necessary in his calling.

---

[1] Exod. xviii. 19.

[2] Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, vol. viii, p. 504.

[3] John xv. 16.

[4] Matt. xxviii. 20.

[5] Heb. v. 4.

The priestly character, formed by these gifts, is one of self-sacrifice, of self-oblation to God for man. Thus, again, the priesthood of the Church reproduces an essential feature of the archetypal priesthood.

And, finally, this priestly character governs the whole life of the priest in all its activities. Whatever he is doing, he does it as a priest, ministering to God for man. He is led to live in daily, hourly dependence on supernatural guidance and on a supernatural grace which sanctifies all his energies. His life becomes, like the life of his great exemplar, a liturgy.

---

[1] *Summa*, Pars III, Supp. Q. xxxvii, Art. 2: *In quolibet ordinum septiformis gratia datur.*

This liturgical character of the priest's life is the theme of this volume, developed in some detail in the chapters which follow.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

The doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, as implied by the terms of the commission to the Apostles, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

A detailed defence of the important doctrine of the Apostolic Succession falls outside the province of this book. But it seems worth while to quote a passage from Bishop Broughton's Sermons, in which he forcibly elaborates the implications of the divine commission. The passage is quoted, with other valuable testimony, in Denton's admirable work, *The Grace of the Ministry a Divine Gift* (Bell & Sons, 1872), p. 85:

"In the very first example of a Christian ordination the Lord himself laid the groundwork of this system, saying, when he gave the apostolical commission, 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' 'As my Father hath sent me' to exercise for a season my personal ministry in the church upon earth, and, on my departure, to make choice of and ordain others to a like office, 'even so'—or upon the same conditions, and with a like commandment—'send I you,' to preach the Gospel while you live, and, when you fail, to convey to others, in succession, the office which you receive from me. This is but the just conclusion arising from his words—as I am *sent*, even so I *send*. And, if it need confirmation, it receives it from the practice of the Apostles, who, as Christ sent *them*, even so sent they *others*. They who know anything of the history of the church are well aware that not only during the earliest ages, but for full fifteen hundred years after the Lord's ascension, no admission to the ministry was acknowledged to be scriptural and valid, except it was conveyed by the laying on of hands of bishops, who had derived their own orders in a direct and unbroken line of succession from the Apostles. There is just the same sufficient historical evidence for the certainty of this, as there is to show that the Scriptures are genuine."

It may be added that in the words of the Church's charter two contrasted words are used. "As my Father hath sent (ἀπέσταλκε) me, even so send (πέμπω) I you." On this Dr. Westcott (additional note on John xx. 21), writes: "In this charge the Lord presents his own mission as the one abiding mission of the Father; this he fulfils through his Church. His disciples receive no new commission, but carry out his. They are not his envoys, but in a secondary degree envoys of the Father."

Canon E. G. Wood's comment may also be profitably added. He writes: "To use the language of a canonist, one would say that while our Lord received *ordinary* jurisdiction from the Father, the Church has received *delegated* jurisdiction from Christ. The former is the idea involved in ἀποστέλλω, the latter is implied in the less restricted, less technical πέμπω. It is also important to mark the tenses used, the perfect (ἀπέσταλκε) implies the permanence which is the root notion of ordinary jurisdiction, it 'describes a mission which continues in its present effects' (Westcott)."[1]

---

[1] *Regal Power of the Church*, footnote p. 2.

CHAPTER III

THE PREPARATION OF THE SACRISTY

λειτουργός τῶν ἁγίων

THE whole life of our Lord, as we have seen, was liturgical. He was a priest not only on Calvary, but from the moment that he came into the world. His life was a liturgy, an ordered service in which he offered himself to God for man in every energy and suffering of his sacred humanity. Calvary was its climax, as the consecration is the climax of the holy mysteries. His death summed up, in one supreme act of self-oblation, his whole sacrificial life.

And this life-long, or rather eternal, self-oblation of the Son of God made man was also summed up in the rite ordained by him to be the perpetual memorial of his death. From the moment when Christ came into the world clothed in human nature he was offering himself in the body he had taken of Mary, as the Victim fulfilling the ancient sacrificial types which he superseded. "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; [he spake of those] which are offered by the law. Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."[1]

---

[1] Heb. x. 5–9.

This offering by our Lord of himself in his body was summarized when, instituting the Christian mysteries, he took bread and brake it and said, "This is my body *which is given for you.* Do [or offer][1] this [body] for my memorial."

Nor was it himself only, as a single individual, that he offered to God, whether in his liturgical life or in the Liturgy which summed it up. It was rather himself as representative and Head of redeemed humanity. He offered himself and his mystical body in him. Every Eucharist is essentially the offering of Christ and of the Church in him.

This offering, the Christian Sacrifice, is the correlative of the Christian Priesthood. Every Christian has his part in it, as a necessary consequence of his part in the priesthood of Christ. The priest who offers has his distinctive relation to it in virtue of his distinctive priesthood.

The Christian priest pre-eminently exercises his priesthood at the Christian altar, offering the Christian sacrifice. But it is surely clear that the Christian priest cannot satisfy the obligations which his share in the Eternal Priesthood lays upon him by the sole act of celebrating, occasionally or frequently, the Christian mysteries. At the altar or away from it, he is still a priest; and this priesthood must express itself in a life which is throughout an ordered ministry to God. In other words, the life of the priest must be liturgical. His mass must be the summary for him, as for the great High Priest, of a life of self-oblation. In the mysteries he offers himself in Christ. His whole life must be a showing of Christ, impersonated in him, to God. He must always be saying mass.[2]

---

[1] The word *ποιεῖν* is used some seventy times in the Septuagint as meaning "to offer." Justin Martyr interprets it in the same sense in the words of the Institution. In a passage so interpenetrated with sacrificial language and ideas, the case seems overwhelmingly strong for this sacrificial sense of *ποιεῖν*. Similarly the word *ἀνάμνησις* is twice certainly used in the Septuagint in the objective sense more frequently expressed by *μνημόσυνον*, a memorial before God. The sacrificial meaning of *ποιεῖν* would seem inevitably to entail an objective rendering of *ἀνάμνησις*.

[2] "Here it is [*i.e.* in the Liturgy] that life's central instinct of recapitulation is found at work."—Evelyn Underhill.

A ready parallel meets us here in the Apostolic injunction to "pray without ceasing."[1] This is rightly explained to mean more than that Christians are to be often at their prayers. It means that the whole life of the Christian should be in a sense prayer, a coming to God, an energizing towards him.

And the parallel suggests an important conclusion as to the relation of the formal liturgy to the liturgical life, parallel to the relation between formal prayer and the life which is itself a continual prayer. For the life of prayer, as experience abundantly proves, involves of necessity a due and constant attention to formal prayer. Similarly, the liturgical life, the life which is throughout a ministry to God, an oblation by the priest of himself in Christ and of Christ in him, depends very much indeed on his formal celebration of the holy mysteries. And the converse is true. We shall never pray as we ought in our formal prayers unless our whole life breathes the spirit of prayer. The priest will never say mass as he ought unless his whole life is imbued with the spirit of the mass, the spirit of oblation.

Hence, in the treatment of the priestly life, two methods are available, corresponding to the influence of the sacerdotal life on the formal ministry at the altar, and the influence of the formal ministry on the life. One might apply the characteristics of the priestly life to the celebration of the holy mysteries. Or one might reverse the process and, taking the Liturgy, regarded as the summary and picture of the life of the priest, elicit from it what should be the main characteristics of the sacerdotal character. It is the latter method which is here adopted. It lends itself to a freshness of treatment, as being the less usual process. And it is the easier method, viewing as it does the macrocosm in the microcosm, the whole ministry of the priest in his formal ministry at the altar.

It is not hoped by this method to deduce a complete body of the ascetics of the priestly life, nor to attempt to extract a lesson from every ceremonial detail of the Liturgy. The former task would be quite possible on these lines, but would entail a lengthy treatise, and, even so, a meticulous attention to details would have its perils. The purpose is rather to reinforce, from a fresh standpoint, certain broad principles of real practical value in the ordering of the priest's life.

---

[1] I Thess. v. 17.

The service of the altar begins, in a sense, in the sacristy. For the due performance of the holy mysteries involves a careful preparation. And the preliminaries in the sacristy afford material for establishing valuable preliminary principles of the priestly life. In a very primary sense these preliminary principles concern those who, whether as students in the seminary, or as deacons approaching the higher order, stand on the threshold of the priestly ministry. But it would be a mistake to limit the usefulness of their consideration to those who are not yet priests, but only preparing for the priesthood. For the energies in which the priesthood should be approached are precisely those in which it is to be exercised throughout its course. The life has to be ordered day by day: the priest needs to look upon each day as a ministry to God and to make it a worthy ministry by the preparation of the sacristy. And this day is best viewed, as revelation[1] and the practice of the Church view it, as beginning with the evening. In the Christian life generally, it is a valuable principle to make good use of what has been called "the daily retreat," the time, that is, between the evening retirement for prayer and sleep and the morning emergence from this retirement into the world of ordinary actions and environment. The rule of life, which devout lay folk find essential, and which is an imperative necessity in the life of a priest, is largely concerned with the use of this daily period: its gradual extension, and the exploring of its possibilities and intensifying of its spiritual activities are common features of advance in holiness. It forms, as it were, the sacristy in which due preparation is made for the liturgy of the day.

---

[1] Gen. i. 5. "And the evening and the morning were the first day": cp. the practice of beginning the observance of a festival with its first Evensong.

Let us proceed then to analyse this "preparation of the sacristy" as made by the priest before entering on the divine liturgy, in order that we may apply its principles to the preparation for the priestly life, the life which is to be a liturgy, and for each period of it, remembering that the preparation made in the sacristy should be a picture in miniature of the activities of the "daily retreat."

It should be noted first that the priest, coming to make this preparation, is presupposed to come with his body fasting and his soul free from mortal sin.

In the preparation itself we may trace four processes, all indispensable to the due performance of the liturgy. They merge naturally and inevitably into one another, forming a continuous and consistent process. We may tabulate them as follows :—

- i. The twofold recollection by the priest of
    - a. His own nothingness and sinfulness as man ;
    - b. His status as empowered by the Holy Ghost, in whose energies he ministers, and as clothed in the priesthood of Christ.
- ii. Interior acts, finding vocal expression, of
    - a. Prayer to the Holy Ghost for those graces needed for the due performance of the service ;
    - b. Association with Christ in his Priesthood ;
    - c. Acts of desire, expressing joy in the divine service.
- iii. The direction of intention, or the formation by the will of a definite resolution, to minister
    - a. For God's glory ;
    - b. In Christ's honour ;
    - c. In conformity with the intentions of the Church ;

  - d. For certain specified ends, subordinate to the above, at his own discretion.
- iv. The ordering of the circumstances, or seeing that all things necessary for the performance of the service are ready.

This process is easily deduced from the prescribed prayers and actions of the sacristy. The first note struck in the *Praeparatio ad Missam*, as used in the Western Church, is that of recollection of sinfulness. "Remember not, Lord, our offences." It is continued in the *De Profundis*, the last of the five psalms repeated, re-echoed in the versicles and responses, and emphasized by the washing of the hands before vesting, a washing probably not originally symbolical, but from quite early times invested with a symbolical meaning which finds expression in the prayer repeated during the action.[1] As we shall see later, this recollection of sinfulness, insisted on as an essential preliminary, is an important element throughout the liturgy, inevitable to it as the anti-typical sin-offering in which the priest offers for his own sins and those of the people.

The recollection by the priest of his status as ministering in the Holy Ghost is involved in the seven prayers praying for cleansing, illumination, strengthening, and enkindling by his operation on the faculties of the soul. It was emphasized by the custom which once obtained of reciting in the sacristy the hymn *Veni Creator*, the canticle especially connected in our service-books with the bestowal of the Holy Ghost at ordination. The association of the priest with Christ in his Priesthood is also suggested by the putting on of the vestments, the clothing of the individual in a garb common to Christian priests at the altar and symbolical of the great High Priest in his Sacrifice on Calvary. Not that the vestments are in their origin symbolical; but the symbolical meaning which has been attached to them has become a commonplace. This association with Christ, emphasized most strikingly at the central moment of the liturgy, is further suggested in the preparation and linked to the action of vesting by the versicle, *Sacerdotes tui induantur justitiam.* Throughout, the familiar Christian idea of "putting on Christ" and being clothed with his righteousness, an idea finding expression in the first clothing of fallen and naked man,[1] is inevitably suggested. And the idea is carried on into the direction of intention, when the priest sets himself to commemorate the life, death, resurrection and ascension of our Lord[2].

---

[1] *cum lavat manus dicat :* Da, Domine, virtutem manibus meis ad abstergendam omnem maculam : ut sine pollutione mentis et corporis valeam tibi servire.

Acts of desire are expressed in the first psalm of the *Praeparatio ad Missam*, *Quam dilecta tabernacula tua.*

And this desire, thus formed in the soul, leads on naturally to the energies of the will by which the priest identifies his own personal intention with that of our Lord and the Church. This intention is in part fixed for him. He is bound to celebrate for the glory of God, the honour of Christ, in conformity with the intentions of the Church and according to her directions, in the rite imposed by authority, and for the benefit of all her members, living and departed. In part, however, it is left to him to formulate certain definite objects for which he will offer, subject to the will of God, and relying on divine guidance. He may form the intention of thanking God for this or that mercy, of praying for this or that special grace, for certain individuals or classes.

---

[1] Gen. iii. 21.

[2] A common form of direction of intention is as follows :—

Directio intentionis. Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas, meus Deus, hoc sacro-sanctum sacrificium, quod ego indignus servulus tuus una cum sacrificiis omnibus tibi unquam oblatis aut offerendis, unitum sanctissimo sacrificio a Domino nostro Jesu Christo in ara crucis oblato, offero divinae majestati tuae, omni pietatis affectu, ex puro amore tuae infinitae bonitatis, secundum ejusdem Domini nostri et sanctae matris ecclesiae intentionem:

1. Ad maximam aeternamque divinae majestatis tuae gloriam, amorem, beneplacitum.
2. In protestationem supremae excellentiae et dominii tui, et nostrae subjectionis et dependentiae a te.
3. In perpetuam commemorationem passionis ac mortis ejusdem Domini nostri.
4. In gratiarum actionem aeternam pro omnibus beneficiis, mihi indignissimo, totique ecclesiae, hucusque collatis et conferendis in aeternum.
5. In satisfactionem peccatorum meorum, omniumque fidelium vivorum et defunctorum.

6. Singulariter, offero pro his NN. vel pro hac gratia obtinenda. Secundario pro his NN. mihi peculiariter commendatis, omnibusque pro quibus orare soleo et teneor, ad impetrandum defunctis requiem, vivisque gratiam te agnoscendi, amandi, glorificandi nunc perfecte in via, olim beate in patria. Suscipe et perfice hoc desiderium meum, uberemque ad pie id complendum gratiam et benedictionem largire. Amen.

Finally, the priest finds his places in the missal, sees that the host is laid on the paten, the sacred vessels duly arranged, the altar prepared, and all else ready for the celebration of the mysteries. He has prepared himself: he has prepared the materials and circumstances. He can enter upon his ministry. He is prepared to perform certain habitual actions of the greatest importance. What is more important still, he is prepared to perform them with certain inward dispositions which lend them a value they could not otherwise have. Exterior habits are necessarily involved in the constant performance of his sacred functions. He sets himself, so far as he is a good priest, to the formation of the interior habits which should accompany them and give a spiritual vitality to them.

Now this matter of forming habits, exterior and interior, the interior informing and giving value to the exterior, is of supreme importance in the whole life of the priest. For the formation of the priestly character it is essential. For as actions often repeated form habits, so habits persevered in form character. A life of such habits, exterior and interior, is precisely the ordered life which constitutes a ministry, a liturgy.

To this life of ordered activities of body and soul we may apply the preliminary principles drawn from a consideration of the preparation of the priest in the sacristy.

In the first place we must set the antecedent conditions. The priest comes to his ministry free from mortal sin, and fasting. Similarly, the ministry of the priestly life requires in him a *freedom from mortal sin* and a *detachment from earthly satisfactions.*

It is important, for the security of the faithful who depend upon the sacraments, to remember that in any formal ministry the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the effect of his ministerial actions. It is, after all, the great High Priest who ministers to the faithful through the earthly priest; and he abides faithful to his covenant. For this reason, not even the most grievous sinfulness on the part of the celebrant can hinder the Christian Sacrifice from being pleasing to God. It is pleasing to him precisely because it is Christ who offers and Christ who is offered. But it does make all the difference in the world to the priest *as an individual* whether he offers in sin, or in a state of grace. As an individual, he can only please God and merit his rewards so far as he is in living union with him by grace. The official union involved in the indelible character of his priesthood is not enough to make him personally pleasing to God, or his personal service pleasing. So long as the priest is in grace, all his actions and sufferings, whether exterior or interior, if offered to God and done or endured for his glory, so long as they be not actually contrary to his known will, constitute an acceptable service. But if he be in sin, not even his good actions are acceptable: they are the output and fruit of a corrupt tree, since his sin has separated him from the good tree,[1] the true Vine alone able to bring forth in its living branches[2] the fruit of good works acceptable to God and claiming his reward.[3] Hence the tragedy of mortal sin in the life of a priest. Officially he is still a priest; still the instrument of the High Priest and his priestly body. They still function through him; but he has no personal lot or part in the merit of his priestly actions. And the daily life of liturgy, of acceptable service to God, is as impossible for him as if he were already in the hell merited by mortal sin.

Many devout laymen live with their baptismal union with Christ unbroken by mortal sin. Venial sin none can avoid, though all should strive against it and root out all affection for it. But mortal sin can be avoided, and the priest, of all men, has most reason to avoid it. If he should be so unhappy as to fall into it, he, of all men, has most reason to seek deliverance from it by the appointed means of a good confession. Not that he must remain in his sin till he has been absolved. An act of contrition, with the definite intention to confess and be absolved on the first opportunity, is sufficient to restore him to a state of grace; a state in which once more he can fulfil the purpose for which as a priest he exists, of ministering to God, in all his activities, for his glory.

---

[1] Matt. vii. 17.

[2] John xv. 1–5.

[3] vid. Collect for Trin. xxv.

It is presupposed that the priest will bring to all his ministry not only freedom from mortal sin but detachment from earthly satisfactions. He goes fasting to the altar because it would be obviously inappropriate that he, privileged with a place of honour at the Table of God, to feed on the Living Bread from Heaven, should first seek his own table and the satisfaction of earthly needs. The fast before communion has the same divine appropriateness as the poverty of Mary at Bethlehem. As it was enough for her that she had the Treasure of the World, so it should be enough for the priest that the Lord is his portion.[1] In his relation to our Lord he finds "the riches of his poverty," and it is expected of him that he should sit loose to the things which satisfy the worldly. Actual poverty sits well on the priest; the spiritual poverty which esteems wealth and worldly pleasure as nothing in comparison with the spiritual riches of his calling is positively required of him.[2] To say that the priest must not be worldly, or carnal-minded, is, after all, to utter the veriest commonplace. He is *constitutus ex hominibus*, separated from the congregation as the visible representative of the heavenly order, and heavenly-mindedness is essential to his vocation.

Coming to his ministry, his day-long and life-long liturgy, with these antecedent qualifications, he yet needs a preparation, of which the preliminaries of the sacristy are a picture, for this ministry and for each day of it. For such preparation he finds his opportunity in the daily retreat, and more especially in the yearly retreat, the monthly day of recollection, which form common features in the priest's rule of life.

---

[1] Deut. xviii. 1, 2, etc.

[2] Ephes. ii. 7.

And this preparation will consist essentially of the process already indicated, which may be tabulated as follows :—

i. *Recollection.*
    a. Of his own nothingness and sinfulness.
    b. Of the dignity of his office, as empowered by the Holy Ghost to minister *in persona Christi.*

This twofold recollection is admirably expressed in the words of St. Paul, " We have this treasure in earthen vessels."[1] It also finds expression in the lines, familiar to many priests :—

O Sacerdos, quid es tu ?
Non es a te, quia de nihilo,
Non es ad te, quia mediator ad Deum,
Non es tibi, quia sponsus ecclesiae,
Non es tui, quia servus omnium,
Non es tu, quia Dei minister,
Quid es ergo ? nihil et omnia,
O Sacerdos.[2]

The priest needs the thought that he is of the common clay of sinful humanity constantly before him, to keep him humble. For he is to minister before God in all his activities *in spiritu humilitatis et in animo contrito.* He needs no less to remember his divine office, the " excellency of the power " which is " of God "[1] and not of him, that he may rise to the possibilities of his calling.

---

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 7.

[2] I have not been able to trace these lines to their source. They are to be found in *The Priest's Book of Private Devotion*, by Oldknow and Crake (Mowbray & Co.), printed on a leaf at the beginning of the book.

ii. *Devotion to the Holy Ghost.*

He will therefore call earnestly upon the Holy Ghost for those gifts of inward illumination and enabling power of which he stands so much in need. He is to be a man "full of the Holy Ghost and faith,"[1] "walking in the comfort of the Holy Ghost,"[2] speaking "in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,"[3] finding, and showing to men, that "joy in the Holy Ghost"[4] which characterizes the kingdom of God. God is to "bear witness" to his ministry "with gifts of the Holy Ghost."[5] The ministry which opened with the ancient invocation, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, needs a like prelude to each period of its exercise.

iii. *Association with Christ.*

The priest is not only a "worker together with"[6] Christ: his work, so far as it is effectual is, in liturgy and life, due to the "effectual working"[7] of Christ in and through him. Ministering *in persona Christi*, he is bound to an especial imitation of Christ which others may mark and imitate in their turn.[8] It will help him to do this if he associates himself with our Lord in the ordinary actions of life, as he is associated with him in his formal ministry at the altar. Thus he may associate his visits with the visit paid by our Lord to the house of Mary and Martha, his relations with children with the gracious dealings with them of him who said "Suffer the little children to come unto me," his conversations with the ministry to the woman of Samaria, his journeyings with the weary walk to Calvary, his rest with that of Christ when, weary with walking, he "sat thus" on the well, and so on. Nor is he limited to the actions of our Saviour recorded in Holy Scripture. For it is certain that the Lord performed the common actions of life as other men do, and performed them perfectly, doing "all to the glory of God."[1] He rose from sleep and prayed, he laboured at common tasks, he ate and drank, walked and grew weary, as other men do; but in all offering his actions and sufferings to God for all men. In all these common things the priest may set himself consciously to imitate him.

---

[1] Acts xi. 24.

[2] Acts ix. 31.

[3] 1 Cor. ii. 13.

[4] Rom. xiv. 17.

[5] Heb. ii. 4.

[6] 2 Cor. vi. 1.

[7] Ephes. iii. 7.

[8] 1 Cor. xi. 1; cp. Thess. i. 6.

iv. *Direction of intention.*

From this association with Christ the direction of intention naturally follows. As the priest, going to the altar to minister in and for Christ, sets his will to perform the service for the right ends, with the fitting motives, so, looking forward to the activities and sufferings of the day, he will offer all his thoughts, words, and deeds to God for his glory, to Christ for his honour. Much of the course of his day is clear to him: he can fairly presume, on most days, what his main occupations will be. Associating himself with our Lord in them, he will resolve to perform them faithfully as an offering to God. Other happenings of the day are as yet uncertain: he may be called upon to face quite unforeseen conditions, to perform unexpected tasks, to endure unlooked-for disappointments or sufferings. But all alike, that which may be presumed with fair certainty and that which will come unanticipated, he can offer to God, setting his will to co-operate in all with the will of God. For it is precisely this intention of pleasing God in what we do that turns the humblest actions, provided the doer be in a state of grace and the thing done not against the will of God, into "good works," acceptable to God in Christ: this right motive, hallowing and, as it were, transubstantiating the common material of life, makes it, like the offering of the altar, "a sweet savour of Christ"[2] to God. Thus we redeem our actions from the realm of the instinctive and irrational and perform a "reasonable service."[3] And it should be remembered that this direction of intention, once made, avails. It is better, of course, if we are able to keep the intention present in our mind throughout the day; looking to God throughout, "as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters,"[1] working throughout consciously under his eye. Certainly it is to be desired that we should often renew our intention: to do so will help our work. But the intention once formed avails to sanctify our most ordinary energies.

---

[1] 1 Cor. x. 31.

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 15.

[3] Rom. xii. 1.

v. *The ordering of circumstances.*

Finally, the priest will order, so far as he may, the arrangement of his time. This again is connected with other preliminaries which we have indicated. It is connected with the invocation of the Holy Ghost, because it is by his gift of counsel that we are enabled to exercise our choice of action according to the will of God. "Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it."[2] It is connected with the direction of intention, first, because the priest will intend to act in conformity with the intention of the church, and the church prescribes for him certain of his actions; and secondly, because while intending, generally, to do all for God's glory, he may also direct his intention to do this or that action for some special purpose, subject to the will of God; to help this or that person, to forward this or that cause. Much of his activity during any day will be fixed for him by his plain obligations. In looking forward to the day he will arrange, so far as it is not already arranged, the time and method of this necessary action. Much remains indeterminate: there is no special obligation to do this thing or that to-day; but having sought the divine guidance he will endeavour to arrange his day as seems most to the glory of God and according to his will. Thus he will seek to "buy up opportunity" or "redeem the time."[3] And this practice will do much to guard him from the danger, besetting all those whose use of their time is largely in their own hands, of dissipation, of a hesitation as to what to do with the time, which often ends in wasting it. It will guard him too from the danger of occupying himself with what is at best secondary or unnecessary, while neglecting what is of primary importance. The man of business finds some such arrangement of his day a practical necessity, if his business is to prosper. The priest, engaged in the work of a ministry which transcends in importance all other business, an *opus Dei*, has of all men the most reason for a prevision which will ensure that, as in the sanctuary, so in the world which he has to make a sanctuary, all things may be done "decently and in order."[1]

---

[1] Ps. cxxiii. 2. [2] Isa. xxx. 21. [3] Ephes. v. 16. ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν.

---

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

CHAPTER IV

LITURGY AND LIFE

ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία

WE come now to consider the Christian Liturgy itself, prepared for by the preliminaries of the sacristy, as a summary and picture of the life of reasonable service for which the priest daily prepares himself. And we may well begin by emphasizing certain general characteristics of the formal service which relate it to the larger service of daily life in the priesthood.

First, then, let us consider what we may call the materials of the Liturgy. As a service it consists of certain actions, accompanied by words, and vitalized by interior acts, as *e.g.* the general intention of doing as the Church requires, the particular intention of addressing God in prayer and the congregation in exhortation, of consecrating by certain words and acts, of cleansing the vessels, and so on.

In making a distinction between words and actions, we follow common usage. But it is well to insist that the distinction is an unreal one. For, quite obviously, words themselves involve actions. The only real distinction is between interior acts, *i.e.* acts in which the body has no part, and exterior acts, which consist of bodily movements, whether of the vocal organs and lips, or of the hands or other members of the body.

The distinction is sometimes drawn between the Eucharist and other services, such as the Divine Office, that the one is a service of acts rather than merely of words, while the others consist of words only. The truth is that all public worship consists necessarily of exterior actions of varied kinds, including both words and gestures. The Divine Office involves not only the enunciation of words, but such actions as kneeling, standing, bowing the head, making the sign of the cross, etc. And the same thing is true of almost all private prayer. Doubtless it is possible to engage in prayer which is wholly interior. But it is not easy and it is certainly rare. Even what is called mental prayer is usually accompanied, if not by some vocal prayer, at least by outward acts of reverence. Ordinarily speaking, prayer and worship, whether public or private, consist of interior and exterior acts. In this, as in life generally, soul and body are partners, acting together. It is worth while to insist upon this, in view of the Puritan depreciation of certain outward acts as a part of worship, based on the curiously unreal distinction between words and acts. It is indeed strange to suppose that those movements of the bodily organs which produce speech are pleasing to God, so long as they are vitalized by a right intention, but that the movements of the head, the knees, or the hands are vain and unprofitable with whatever intention performed. The dissenting prayer-meeting, no less than the Church Liturgy, is a series of exterior actions, a series of gestures.

It is, however, true that in the Liturgy, as in daily life, importance is attached to actions other than those which produce vocal sounds. And it is this characteristic that makes the Eucharist a unique picture of the daily life. The sentence of Divine Wisdom that " a man full of words shall not prosper upon the earth," is a commonplace of worldly experience. In the Liturgy, essentially a drama, as in life, " deeds speak louder than words." And many of the actions performed are common actions of everyday life, invested by their setting, and the intention which gives them a meaning and value, with a dignity not usually associated with them in daily life. Thus the priest not only speaks to God and man, not only performs gestures especially associated with religion, but goes to and fro, washes his hands, eats and drinks, cleanses the vessels of his ministry. And the most common action, no less than the most sublime prayer, is offered in God's honour, and forms part of an acceptable worship. Whether he eats or drinks, or whatsoever he does, the celebrant is doing "all to the glory of God."[1] Emphatically the Liturgy shows us how all life may be a liturgy in which the most ordinary actions, vitalized by a supernatural intention and the energies of grace, form part of our "reasonable service."

Moreover, the Liturgy lays stress on the manner of performing outward actions, whether of speech or of other kinds. The least word has to be properly enunciated, the most insignificant action rightly performed. It is this careful prescription as to details that represses, where it is duly observed, undue expression of individuality. It may truly be said that the Mass aims at that combination of efficiency and unobtrusiveness in action which is at once so rare and so valuable in daily life. The perfect elaboration of the smallest action, the attention both to motive and manner, the inner spirit which gives value, the outward performance which gives effect: here is the secret of efficiency. And unobtrusiveness is no less secured by the uniformity of action imposed on every priest. Vested in the common garb of all priests, a garb which leaves practically no room for the exercise of personal choice or taste, the celebrant goes to the altar to perform a service in which every action is prescribed, not only as to its performance, but as to the manner of its performance. Here he is to speak aloud, here with the "humble" voice: all he says and all he does is so ordered as to preclude, as far as can possibly be done, the expression of his individuality. And this repression of individuality has a very great value, not only for the priest, but also in regard to the sense of mystery and dignity which pervades the Liturgy as a consequence of it. The mouthing of words and exaggeration of manner which characterize many officiants at Protestant services seem to attempt to invest with solemnity a rite which, apart from such adventitious aids, has little real intrinsic dignity. The quiet naturalness and reverent simplicity of the Catholic priest bear a truer witness to the atmosphere of spiritual reality which seems to forbid, rather than to require, tricks of individual intonation and gesture.

---

[1] 1 Cor. x. 31.

Efficiency and self-effacement: the careful performance with right inward dispositions of the most common actions, with a quiet simplicity and avoidance of self-assertion and fussiness: these characteristics of the Liturgy characterize the priestly life of which the Liturgy is a picture.

Secondly, we may consider the personal relations of the priest at the altar. Here, again, we shall find that the Liturgy admirably pictures the true ideal of Christian and sacerdotal life. The service is, of course, primarily a ministry to God. And in it the priest speaks mainly to God. But it is also a ministry to man for God; and the priest also addresses his fellow men, gathered to worship with him. His utterances to God are a model for all such utterances in his life. There is every kind of prayer. Praise, thanksgiving, confession, petition for material and spiritual benefits, for himself and for others, generically and specifically, all have their place. But there is a proportion in them which does not always find observance in private prayer. The prayers are far more occupied with God's glory than with man's need: praise and thanksgiving predominate. And while the Mass affords no sort of encouragement for the superiority which affects hesitation in asking God, subject, of course, to his wisdom and will, for material benefits, these material benefits are subordinated to the spiritual gifts which are our greatest need. And all utterances to God are characterized by a reverence of diction in approaching him. Again, when the priest speaks to man, it is in an atmosphere which emphasizes the fact that he speaks for God and before him. Yet, if we may dare to say so, man is as considerately treated as God in the allocutions of the Liturgy. From the praises of God the priest turns to man with a gesture of grave courtesy and the greeting, "The Lord be with you." Set in authority in the Church, he has the right to command, but speaks for the most part in terms of exhortation : he is a father, but speaks rather as an elder brother to his "brethren." His relation to God is one of loving intimacy—he speaks as naturally about going to the altar of his God as about visiting the house of a friend—characterized by the deepest reverence: his relations with man are of an affectionate brotherliness marked by dignity and courtesy. He speaks much to God, little to man; but grudges no word of greeting, nor the use of an appropriate endearment. Nor is it enough to say that the Liturgy exhibits the priest in ideal relations with God and man. We must add that his relations with man are not exclusively concerned with the congregation present in church; nor even with the whole church militant on earth. They concern all men, the living and the dead. The priest prays for all. It is as though the Liturgy had brought together in one vast congregation, annihilating the bounds of space and time, the great body of worshippers for whom, and, in a sense, by whom, it is offered through the priest as their representative. Nor is the priest conscious only of the living and dead for whom he offers. The glorified saints and the holy angels, whose every need is satisfied in the Vision of God, are present to him. He associates himself and the Church on earth with "the company of heaven" in the worship of God. Heaven and earth meet at the altar. It is as though heaven had come down to earth and the earthly sanctuary was filled with presences from heaven; as though the earthly transaction was caught up into the presence of God in heaven to blend with the worship there before the throne. In the fullest possible sense of the words the saying is realized that "our conversation is in heaven."[1]

---

[1] Phil. iii. 20.

The priest moves to and fro, addresses supplication to God, greeting and exhortation to man, performs the common actions of earth, against an eternal background. We are reminded of the Life of Christ on earth, of the angels at Bethlehem, in the wilderness and at Gethsemane, of the opening of the heavens at Jordan, of the saints on the Mount of Transfiguration.

And thus, again, the Liturgy presents us with an ideal view of life and its relationships. After all, the Incarnation has brought heaven down to earth, and translated man, a new creature in Christ, into the heavenly order. The company of heaven is not far off. We are "come to" it.[1] It is around us as we move about the world on our daily tasks. The angels, ever beholding the face of the Father in heaven, are yet round about us to succour and defend us: the visible company in which we move on earth is not nearer or more real than the invisible company. It is precisely the work of grace, illuminating the soul, to awaken it to these invisible realities; to open our eyes that we may see. The true view of life is that with which the Liturgy supplies us, that of a transaction in time against an eternal background.

Once more, as regards the priest himself, the Liturgy sets him to employ, in the service of God, every energy which he requires to exercise for his own spiritual development. We have seen that his worship is both interior and exterior, that it claims energies of soul and body. We may go further and note how it exercises and develops every faculty of the soul. The human soul, a single substance, functions in three directions which we distinguish as cognitions, volitions and emotions. In other words, there is the mind that thinks or reasons and knows; there is the will that chooses or resolves; the heart or affections that feel, the realm of emotions whether of love or sorrow or hatred. All these faculties of the soul are meant to be directed towards God: the mind is to know him, the will to serve him, the heart to love him. For this, indeed, and for nothing else, was man created. The tragedy of the Fall lay precisely in this, that it lost man the grace of God by which alone he was able to fulfil his true purpose: his mind was darkened, his will weakened, his heart corrupted. And the whole object to which the redemption of man by the Incarnation of the Son of God was directed was the recovery for man of this faculty of knowing, serving, and loving God, in and through Christ. Hence man, renewed in Christ at baptism, receives the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity: so called precisely because they enable all the energies of the soul to function towards God. And the Christian life consists of the development of these virtues by their exercise: the soul, dowered with these gifts, is to go on "stedfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity."[1] Christian perfection involves essentially the perfecting, by grace and by use, of these qualities by which the soul apprehends God, reaches out to him and embraces him. For the perfection of heaven consists of nothing else but the Vision of God, of which faith is the beginning, the Fruition of him, which is the attainment of hope, and the Love of him, which is charity perfected.

---

[1] Heb. xii. 22.

Now the Liturgy is the expression and exercise of these faculties of the soul, as may easily be seen from a glance at it. A recent writer has pointed out that "in the Mass, as it is actually celebrated all the world over, . . . our Lord exercises, through His ministers, a threefold function, even as He exercised a threefold function in His visible human life on earth. . . . As Prophet, as God made Man that He might become His own messenger to mankind, He claims our faith. As our High Priest He laid, by His all-atoning sacrifice, the foundations of our hope. As King He appeals to our loyalty and love. Now to this threefold function of Christ our Lord correspond the three main portions into which the sacred liturgy of the Mass, apart from preliminaries and supplementary accretions, is divided."[1]

---

[1] Prayer in Baptismal Office.

The same writer goes on to divide the service into :—

i. The *missa catechumenorum*, from the beginning down to the Creed, consisting largely of lections from Holy Scriptures, which corresponds to the teaching office of our Lord and makes an appeal primarily to our faith.

ii. From the offertory to the Canon, constituting the specifically sacrificial portion of the service, revealing Christ as our High Priest, and exercising the hope which looks for salvation through His sacrifice.

iii. The concluding portion, of which the Communion is the essential element, especially calling out in the faithful the love which leads them to be loyal to Christ as their King and to keep His commandments.

Divisions of this kind, useful as they are, have their dangers, if too closely pressed. This is true even of the division of the faculties of the soul, which are not really separate entities, but an analysis of the operation of a single substance : it is true also in a certain sense of the theological virtues, which are an analysis of the power of grace in its action on the three wounds of the soul. Faith, hope and charity, regarded strictly as virtues, cannot exist apart.[2] And the Mass is throughout an exercise of the spiritual faculties in which all three are interwoven. The priest recites words and performs actions which express and exercise these three virtues ; precisely the virtues he is called upon to exercise in the Christian life. Here again "life's central instinct for recapitulation is found at work."

---

[1] *Holy Mass*, by Fr. Lucas, vol. I, chap. iii, pp. 24, 25 (Manresa Press).

[2] It is not forgotten that the Council of Trent lays down that *fides haberi potest sine spe*, etc. This is in accordance with the teaching of St. Thomas, who states *fides et spes sine charitate possunt quidem aliqualiter esse*. But he explains the qualification implied in *aliqualiter* by adding later *sed sine charitate, proprie loquendo, non sunt virtutes* (*Summa*, Prima Secundi, Q. lxv, Art. 4). The faith and hope which exist without charity are not so much the theological virtues as the attitude of mind and will formed by them.

The underlying dispositions of the Liturgy are those of the Christian life, faith that steadies, hope that inspires, and charity as the radical energy and motive throughout.

Finally, the Liturgy embodies the three great aspects of the Christian life which ascetic writers distinguish as *Via Purgativa*, *Via Illuminativa*, and *Via Unitiva*. These three aspects were foreshadowed under the old covenant by the three different classes of sacrifices.

The sin-offering, or sacrifice of propitiation, belonged to the category which described life in terms of salvation from sin. It witnessed to man's conviction that his first need was cleansing from defilement, reconciliation to an all-holy God from whom he was parted by his guilt. It typified our Lord as the victim for sin to come, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. And, as we insist that our Lord was a priest not only on Calvary, but from the beginning of his life, so we must find in his whole life, viewed as a warfare against the sin of the world, the antitype of the sin-offering. Our Lord in fact suffered for our sin, not only in his Passion, but at every moment of his incarnate life. Sin had induced in the world a condition of suffering, and God took flesh and came into this world to drink the cup of suffering, to feel all the weight of the penalty which had fallen upon the world as a result of sin. As the Representative of a sinful race, he did penance throughout his life. Sinless as he was, he was yet in a real sense the antitype of David as the Royal Penitent. And the Church, his body, follows him along the road of penitence. Offering him as their sin-offering, the faithful associate themselves with him in activities of penance, and offer themselves in him to suffer for sin. It is this aspect of the Christian life that constitutes the *Via Purgativa.*

The burnt-offering, or sacrifice of praise, differed from the sin-offering in that it laid less emphasis on the sin of man, directing attention rather to the supreme dominion and absolute claims of God. In the sin-offering, man, the sinner, bowed down before the holy

God, confessing his sin and seeking reconciliation. In the burnt-offering, he stood upright, as it were, to yield to a sovereign God his due of worship. While the one emphasized man's sinfulness, the other expressed his dignity as a creature entering into relation with his Creator. If the sin-offering answers to reconciliation with God, the burnt-offering answers to sanctification. It represents man as drawn into the light, as he approaches in worship the uncreated Light. The acceptance of the sacrifice by God, symbolized by the fire that consumes it, is the prominent idea in the burnt-sacrifice, as its very name indicates. Thus the sacrifice of praise answers to an important aspect of the Christian life, in which it is regarded as an illumination. This aspect is emphasized in our Lord himself where he is described as the True Light coming into a world of darkness. And it is prominent in the idea of the Church as enlightened by him. The children of Israel, having light in the land of Goshen, while Egypt lay in darkness, typifies the supernatural light in which the children of God walk, while around them darkness is over a world that knows not God. Hence Holy Scripture speaks of Baptism as an " enlightenment,"[1] a deliverance from the power of darkness,[2] a calling into God's marvellous light[3]; and Christians are called the children of light.[4] The Christian life is viewed, in fact, as one of growing illumination, a path that " shineth more and more unto the perfect day."[5] And passages in similar terms might be multiplied, if it were necessary to do so. What is perhaps especially worthy of notice, as bearing upon the connection of the Liturgy with this category of illumination, is the idea found in the Old Testament of Jerusalem with its sanctuary, and of the sanctuary itself, as a centre of divine illumination. The law was to go forth from Jerusalem, enlightening the chosen people and, as Isaiah insists, the Gentile world around, with the knowledge of God.[6] The psalmist, perplexed by life's problems, failed to understand until he came to the sanctuary of God,[1] with its seven-branched candlestick symbolizing the illumination of the Holy Ghost. The Christian sanctuary is the home of that divine illumination which characterizes the Christian life: the Liturgy, the *sacrificium laudis* of the New Covenant, is the central example and recapitulation of its action upon the faculties of the soul energized by grace.

---

[1] Heb. x. 32.
[2] Col. i. 13.
[3] 1 Pet. ii. 9.
[4] Thess. v. 5.
[5] Prov. iv. 18.
[6] Isa. ii. 3, 5; lx. 1–3, etc.

Finally, the Jew had the peace-offering, with its prominent feature of the sacrificial meal: a feast in which priest and people banqueted with God; the priest in a special degree, certain parts of the sacrifice being especially assigned to him as "the priest's portion."[2] It is not necessary to labour the point that this type of sacrifice, of which the Passover was the most conspicuous instance, strikingly expressed the special intimacy with God to which the chosen people was admitted. Nor, again, is it necessary to point out at length that this intimacy with God is the supreme privilege offered in the Christian Church, nor to quote the numerous passages which express the ideas summed up in the category of fellowship. The most superficial acquaintance, moreover, with the Christian Liturgy reveals it as the central embodiment and expression of this fellowship with God in Christ. It is, as all Christian life is meant to be, as the sacerdotal life is pre-eminently meant to be, a communion with God.

These three aspects of the Christian life, as a reconciliation, a progressive illumination, an intimate communion, which find their formal expression in the central act of Christian worship, are obviously of the greatest importance in the life of the individual Christian. The priest, separated both in liturgy and life as the representative alike of Christ and of the Christian, is especially called upon to embody them in his daily life. In the following chapters it is proposed to examine them singly and at some length, with a view to basing on them some conclusions of practical value.

---

[1] Ps. lxxiii. 15,16.

[2] Lev. vii. 35.

CHAPTER V

THE LITURGY OF PENANCE

ἱλασμός περί ἁμαρτιῶν

THE roots of the Christian Liturgy are to be found in the sacrifices of the old covenant. This has been the constant teaching of Christian writers. It is involved in the well-known maxim, *Novum Testamentum in vetere latet: vetus Testamentum in novo patet.* It finds particular expression in an ancient prayer of the Leonine sacramentary which begins, *Deus qui legalium differentiam hostiarum unius sacrificii perfectione sanxisti.*"[1] We have seen that these sacrifices of the Mosaic Law fell into three classes, the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering. But before examining these typical rites in detail, with a view to tracing in them aspects of the Christian Liturgy and the life of which it is a summary, it will be well to summarize briefly the Jewish ritual of sacrifice, in order to estimate the distinctions between the various sacrifices, which are throughout based on the emphasis variously accorded to different parts of the ritual.

It should be remembered, then, that the old ritual of sacrifice embraced six actions, which were as follows:[2]

1. The presentation of the victim by the offerer.
2. The laying of hands on the victim by the offerer.
3. The slaying of the victim by the offerer.
4. The sprinkling of the blood by the priest, or reconciliation by blood.
5. The burning upon the altar by the priest, or offering by fire.
6. The feast on the sacrifice, shared by priest and offerer.

---

[1] Secret for the Seventh Sunday after Pentecost in the Latin Missal.

[2] Willis, *Worship of the Old Covenant*, p. 35 sqq.

All these actions except the last were common to all sacrifices. The sin-offering emphasized the reconciliation by blood; the burnt-offering, or sacrifice of praise, the offering by fire; the peace-offering, or eucharist, the sacrificial feast.

With this necessary preliminary, we may proceed to consider the sin-offering, with the aspects of religion which it embodied.

The sin-offering as such, although it emphasized ideas of religion as old as the Fall and expressed in the earlier sacrifices, was the creation of the Sinaitic Covenant. And this appropriately, since it was the function of the Law, as St. Paul reminds us, to lay stress on the exceeding sinfulness of sin.[1] Its characteristic feature was the presentation of the blood, regarded as the life of the victim forfeit by sin.[2] This was placed on the horns of the brazen altar in the outer court of the tabernacle, the remainder of it being poured out at the foot of the altar.[3] In the case of the sin-offerings of the high priest and those of the whole congregation, the anointing of the horns of the brazen altar was followed by a more elaborate ritual. The blood was taken into the tabernacle itself, placed upon the horns of the golden altar in the Holy Place, and sprinkled seven times in front of the vail behind which was the Holy of Holies.[4]

The idea of substitution was emphasized by a significant ceremony in connection with the imposition of hands. While the offerer laid his hands on the head of the victim, he faced west and recited a formula of confession, as follows: "I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have rebelled, and thus and thus have I done" (here he confessed his sin in detail); "but now I return to thee by repentance, and let this be my expiation."[5] It will be noted that the confession of Achan in the book of Joshua[6] is made in like form. This detailed confession is insisted on by Jewish tradition. Thus Maimonides says: "He who is frequent and long in confession is worthy of praise." And it was made in the hearing of the officiating priest, who stood by to receive the blood of the victim and to make atonement[1] with it upon the altar.

---

[1] vid. Rom. iii. 20, iv. 15, v. 13, 20, vii. 13.

[2] Gen. ix. 4; Lev. xvii. 11, 14.

[3] Lev. iv. 22–35.

[4] Lev. iv. 3–21.

[5] Willis, pp. 141–2.

[6] Josh. vii. 20–21.

It should be remembered that the sin-offering might not be offered for open breaches of the moral law as embodied in the ten commandments, but only for bodily defilements, ceremonial offences, sins committed in ignorance or involuntarily, and certain lesser breaches of the law which were specified.[2] Hence for Achan no sacrifice could be offered: he must give his own life for his sin. The same penalty of death was due for David's double sin of adultery and murder, but in his case, by a special mercy of God, the penalty was remitted and the life of his son accepted instead.[3] But no sacrifice was offered: such could not be accepted for his sin. Living on with his sin put away by the "great goodness" of God, all he might offer was "a broken and contrite heart."[4] It is this inability of the legal sin-offering to atone for grave offences which gives especial point to St. John's triumphant insistence that the Blood of the antitypical sin-offering "cleanses us from all sin."[5]

Thus the sin-offering expressed the idea, prominent from the Fall, that sin entailed sorrow and death, tears and blood, together with the assurance that through tears and blood there lay a way back to the God offended by sin. The shame of our first parents and the sorrow which expressed itself in their confession issued in the clothing of their nakedness with the raiment which cost the first shedding of blood, the first death on the earth[6]; the transaction being accompanied by the first promise of a Redeemer to come, who should break the power of sin.

---

[1] Lev. xvii. 11.

[2] vid. Lev. iv., v., vi., xii., xv.; Num. xv.

[3] 2 Sam. xi., xii.

[4] Ps. li.

[5] 1 John i. 7.

[6] Gen. iii.

All these elements, man's contrition for sin, expressed by humble confession, his rehabilitation by the atoning blood of an innocent victim substituted in his stead, and the implicit promise of the Lamb of God who should take away sin, were expressed and perpetuated by the legal sin-offering.

Another significant point in the ritual of the propitiatory sacrifice must not be overlooked. After the shedding and manipulation of the blood, portions of the sacrifice were laid upon the altar of burnt-offering and consumed by fire,[1] symbolizing God's acceptance of the sacrifice. Then, in the case of ordinary sin-offerings, the remainder became the food of the officiating priests.[2] Only in the case of the sin-offerings of the high-priest and of the whole congregation was other provision made, the rest of the sacrifice being burnt with fire outside the camp.[3] This enactment that the priests should eat the sin-offerings is explained in Leviticus x. 17: "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." Thus the representative character of the ministerial priesthood was emphasized. The priest, no less than the victim, was to represent the repentance of the sinner. We may add, in the light of the New Testament, that the priest, no less than the victim, was to represent the promised Deliverer from sin. So Bishop Patrick, in his commentary on the passage quoted from Leviticus, writes: "The very eating of the people's sin-offering argued the sins of the people were, in some sort, laid upon the priests, to be taken away by them. From whence the sacrifice of Christ may be explained, who is said to *bear our iniquity* (as the priest is here said to do), all our sins being *laid on him;* who took upon him to make an expiation for them, by the sacrifice of himself. For the priest hereby eating of the sin-offering, receiving the guilt upon himself, may well be thought to prefigure One, who should be both priest and sacrifice for sin; which was accomplished in Christ."[4]

---

[1] Lev. iv. 8–10.

[2] Lev. vi. 26–29; x. 17, 18.

[3] Lev. iv. 12, 21.

[4] Commentary on Lev. x. 17.

Novum Testamentum in vetere latet. We may expect to find in the formal worship of the Christian Church the antitype of a transaction which expresses man's sorrow for sin and God's remission of it by atoning blood: we may expect to find assigned to the ministerial priest functions which point to his representative character, both in relation to the penitence of man and the forgiveness of God. And this we actually find in the Liturgy, regarded as the Christian sacrifice of propitiation. It is quite unnecessary here to point out at any length how our Lord, pouring out his blood on the cross, and offering his body to God "without the camp"[1] is, in his saving death, the antitypical sacrifice of propitiation, obtaining pardon not only for the guilty nation which gave him to death with the cry "His blood be on us,"[2] but for the whole guilty race of man. And we have already insisted that what is true of his death is no less true of his life, of which that death was both the climax and the summary. Some years before His death John the Baptist could point to him as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."[3] Throughout he was giving himself to God for man in a life of toil and suffering, the consequence and penalty of human sin. Throughout, he was not only the Deliverer from sin promised by God and bringing from God to man the promised reconciliation: he was also, as the Royal Penitent, the Representative of a race which laboured and suffered and went on its way to death, which sought through tears and blood the renewal of relations with God broken by sin, the deliverance from sin and from its terrible consequences.

The Eucharist, with which we are especially concerned, was the summary of this life of giving himself to suffer for man no less than the representation of his atoning death. In it he gave his body for us, before he gave it to us. And he consecrated the offering by the imposition of hands, the very rite to which an especial emphasis was given in the legal type. The ceremonial manipulation of the blood, the most characteristic feature of the sin-offering, finds its antitype in the mystical separation of his blood under the outward form of wine, that wine which he made "my blood of the New Covenant," set apart from "my body which is given for you" exhibited under the form of bread. Thus in the Eucharist as in his life and death our Lord represents sinful and penitent humanity drawing near to God through an offering with which he identifies himself in the laying on of hands, while he also identifies himself with the priest presenting the blood of the sacrifice before God and making atonement by it for the sins of man. And in this transaction he especially associates with himself the Apostles. As the priests of old offered and ate the sin-offerings of the people, they first are to offer and to eat the body given for men, the body of the Lamb of God, who is "the propitiation for our sins."[1] Called by him especially to drink of his cup,[2] they are first to drink of the eucharistic cup of his blood, and in their turn to make by consecration the mystic separation of the blood from the body, and to communicate it to the faithful.

---

[1] Heb. xiii. 13.
[2] Matt. xxvii. 25.
[3] John i. 29, 36.

Thus from its very institution the Eucharist stands revealed as the Christian sacrifice of propitiation, or sin-offering. It reveals moreover the existence in the Apostles of a special and distinct *sacerdotium*, according to them a special and representative position, parallel to that of the priests under the old law, in connection with the offering of a more perfect sacrifice, the pleading of a "richer blood." Like their Master they represented alike the penitence of man, seeking to approach God with humble sorrow for sin, and the tender mercy of God, rehabilitating him through the atoning blood presented at the altar.

And the Liturgy of to-day, enshrining the rite as originally instituted, contains in all its known varieties the significant features which connect the new sacrifice with the old sin-offering and explicitly develops their significance in its ritual and ceremonial developments.

---

[1] 1 John ii. 2.

[2] Matt. xx. 23, Mark x. 39.

As our Lord came forth from the Father to do the will of God, the priest comes out from the sacristy with his intention formed to glorify God. The will of God involved a life lived in the shadow of the cross, a life of penance for man's sin. So the priest comes, bearing the cross upon his shoulders, as St. Thomas à Kempis has said,[1] to symbolize the cross-bearing of his office, and bows himself in penitence and humble confession of sin at the foot of the altar before he goes up to it to begin his ministry. At the altar he utters the cry of the penitent sinner, *Kyrie eleison*, " Lord, have mercy upon us." And this attitude of penitence with which the service opens characterizes it to its close. *In spiritu humilitatis et in animo contrito*, weighed down by a burden of sin which is intolerable, yet seeking to wash his hands in innocency, praying that God will purify his heart, doing penance for his own sin and, as their representative, for the sins of the people, he approaches the offering of him who is " the propitiation for our sins," him whom he will salute as the " Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world," to find through him mercy and reconciliation with God. Thus the part of the service which precedes the main action becomes a preparation of repentance for it, a drawing near in humble contrition, as the penitent of old brought his victim and confessed his sin over it as a prelude to the reconciliation by its blood. So far, indeed, the functions of the priest in relation to sin are mainly those of representing the sinner in his penitence. In the central action he combines this function with that of representing the High Priest of our profession making atonement for our sin. For after laying his hands upon the elements, he separates the blood by the mystic sword of consecration, pronouncing the bread to be Christ's body, the wine his blood. He stands there, as the priest in the sin-offering stood at the brazen altar with the blood of the victim in his hands. And while the blood " which speaketh better things than that of

---

[1] *De Imitatione Christi*, l. iv., c. v.

Abel"[1] cries to God from the altar, as it pleads in the five wounds of the "Lamb as it had been slain"[2] in heaven, the priest prays for the "remission of sins," the "pardoning" of "our offences," which can only come through it. Once more he bows down in penitence proclaiming his own unworthiness. Then he eats of the sacrifice, as the priest of old ate of the sin-offering, by a representative communion which is an integral part of the rite, thus associating himself with Christ as the sin-bearer, feeding on him who was "made sin for us."

The Liturgy thus reveals the priest as *alter Christus* in this special sense of impersonating him, alike as the representative of man's penitence and as the minister of his reconciliation with God.

But it is necessary here to add a word of caution. It might be supposed that the Eucharist, as the Christian sacrifice of propitiation,[3] would win for those on whose behalf it was offered the forgiveness of all sin. This the old sin-offering was, as we have seen, powerless to effect. But it is the glory of the blood of Jesus, offered to God in the eucharistic oblation, that it "cleanses us from all sin." Yet it has been the constant teaching of the church that the holy sacrifice avails not for the pardon of those in mortal sin. Like the sin-offering of the law, it cleanses only from the lesser stain of venial sin.[4] It is presupposed that those who come to offer it come already cleansed from the guilt of mortal sin. How are we to explain this apparent failure of the antitypical offering to exceed its type in this respect?

The truth is that there is a larger liturgy in the formal ceremonial of the church to include the fulness of the pardon conveyed through the atoning blood of Christ. And this larger liturgy is necessary to fulfil the type of the sin-offering. For we have seen that the legal offering was valid in view of the mystical identification of the sinner with the victim for sin, expressed by the imposition of hands. The completeness of fulfilment of the ancient type demands in the new covenant provision for something more, "some better thing,"[1] than an identification of the offerer with the victim which is merely mystical and symbolical. It demands an identification which shall be real and substantial. This is effected in baptism when, "washed in his blood,"[2] we are made actual members of Christ, in the church which is his body, "members of his flesh and of his bones."[3] As the Jew stood by the altar while his sacrifice was offered, united in type and symbol to Christ, prefigured by the propitiatory victim, so we come to the altar united to him, a "new creature"[4] in him, in virtue of baptism. This substantial union with Christ by grace is broken and interrupted by mortal sin, and hence the provision of that other Sacrament of the precious Blood, in which the sinner comes again to the "fountain opened to the house of David for sin and for uncleanness,"[5] to be readmitted to the favour of God and the union of grace which his sin had forfeited. The actual cleansing from mortal sin is indeed effected by the precious Blood. But it stands outside the formal liturgy of the Eucharist, precisely because that liturgy must fulfil the ancient type by bringing the offerer to the altar already united to the saving Victim, not in figure but in reality. The larger liturgy of the church, beginning with baptism, and leading man, thus cleansed from all sin and united to Christ, to offer sacrifice at the altar, reveals an antitypical order, excelling the ancient types as exhibiting the operation of a blood that cleanses "from all sin." The eucharistic sacrifice avails for those already cleansed in a fuller liturgy of which it is part. It avails, that is, for those who have kept white the baptismal robe of the soul, or cleansed it anew in the precious Blood in Penance.

---

[1] Heb. xii. 24.

[2] Rev. v. 6.

[3] See Additional Note A at end of chapter.

[4] See Additional Note B at end of chapter.

From this necessary explanation we may return to our main point. The Christian Liturgy represents the priest as doing penance, not for himself alone, but for the people. This Liturgy illustrates in miniature that sacerdotal life which is meant to be itself liturgical. An important aspect, therefore, of the priest's life is that under which it is regarded as doing penance, as being, in a special and representative sense, "a death unto sin," a cross-bearing, a life of mortification which prepares for the ultimate penance of death. To these energies of penitence, emphasized in the phrase *via purgativa*, we must devote a separate chapter.

---

[1] Heb. xi. 40.

[2] Rev. i. 5.

[3] Ephes. v. 30.

[4] 2 Cor. v. 17.

[5] Zech. xiii. 1.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER V

A. *On the Christian Liturgy as a Sacrifice of Propitiation.*

I have left on one side in this chapter the theological issues raised in calling the Mass a sacrifice of propitiation. The point emphasized has been that the Eucharist is a summary and picture of our Lord's Life and of his Death, and that in both he was doing penance for sin. Hence I deduce the propitiatory character of the Mass, as the Christian sin-offering. The propitiatory character of the Christian sacrifice is expressly taught by the great Fathers and by Catholic theologians generally. St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechetical Lectures calls it "this sacrifice of propitiation" (τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ). And St. Gregory the Great writes (L. iv, c. 58): "Haec namque singulariter victima ab interitu animam salvat, quae illam nobis mortem Unigeniti per mysterium reparat. Qui licet resurgens ex mortuis jam non moritur, tamen in semetipsum immortaliter atque incorruptibiliter vivens, pro nobis iterum in mysterio sacrae oblationis immolatur. . . . Hinc ergo pensemus quale sit pro nobis hoc sacrificium, quod pro absolutione nostra semper passionem unigeniti Filii imitatur."

Needless to say, the Eucharist is not propitiatory in the same unique sense as the Sacrifice of Calvary. The Prayer of Consecration in our English Liturgy rightly emphasizes the fact that our Lord "made by his one oblation of himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Catholic theology constantly insists on this truth, maintaining that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is propitiatory only in the sense that it is applicatory of the merits of Calvary. The following passage from Cornelius à Lapide (on Heb. vii. 27) may be cited as an instance of language almost identical with that of the Prayer Book: "Unicum esse Christi sacrificium expiatorium, redemptorium, et satisfactorium omnium peccatorum, scilicet sacrificium crucis: illo enim Christus obtulit pretium sufficiens pro culpis et debitis peccatorum omnium, quae umquam commissa sunt, vel deinceps committentur. Missa autem sacrificium est non redemptorium et satisfactorium, sed applicatorium redemptionis et satisfactionis Christi in cruce peractae, in Missa enim non novum offerimus pro peccatis pretium, sed primaevum crucis pretium et lytrum nobis applicamus."

B. *On the Christian Sacrifice as obtaining the forgiveness of sins.*

Some further explanation seems to be required of the statement in the foregoing chapter (p. 69) that the Christian Sacrifice obtains the forgiveness of venial, but not of mortal, sin. All theologians are agreed that the Eucharist does not obtain the forgiveness of mortal sins generally, except indirectly, by gaining for those in sin the grace of contrition. So Perrone writes: "Ast si sermo sit de culpis gravibus, certum est Eucharistiam, etiam quatenus est sacrificium, ipsas nonnisi *mediate* delere, impetrando nimirum gratias et dispositiones necessarias ad earum detestationem." Some theologians have held that the mass remits mortal sin *per accidens* for those who do not know that they have committed mortal sin; others again have denied this effect. With regard to venial sin, some theologians deny that even this is remitted immediately by the Christian sacrifice. But the more usual view is that which I have expressed.

Thus Marchantius writes: "Quaeritur, quae peccata hic expientur? Respondeo: Primo, manifestum esse, ad venialem expiationem omnino proficere hoc sacrificium sua institutione. Cum enim Deus non ignoraret figmentum nostrum, creaturae suae fragilem statum . . . providit ei hoc opportunum remedium sacrificii quotidiani, pro culpis quotidianis, in quas incidit vel ex fragilitate, vel ex inconsideratione, vel ex negligentia, aut ignorantia. Quapropter sic orat sacerdos: *Suscipe sancte Pater hanc immaculatam hostiam quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero pro innumerabilibus peccatis, offensis, et negligentiis meis, et pro omnibus circumstantibus: sed et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis, etc.*" "Secundo," Marchantius adds, "valet pro mortalibus." But here he is careful to point out, as Perrone does in the passage cited above, that this effect is indirect.

If the statement as to the forgiveness of venial sin be further guarded by limiting this forgiveness to those who are free from mortal sin, probably no theologian would question it. What St. Augustine says on the subject of offering for the departed implies this effect for those who have died in grace. "Pro non valde malis [sacrificia] *propitiationes sunt.*" (Ench. L. I, c. xxx).

CHAPTER VI

THE PENITENTIAL LIFE

ὀφείλει καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτω καὶ περί ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν περί ἁμαρτιῶν.

DIVINE revelation, insisting strongly throughout on the holiness of God, insists also on the necessity of holiness in man as a condition of his intercourse with God in worship. The Church, existing to worship God, has holiness as an essential mark. And grace, the power by which in the Church men are enabled to move towards God, is essentially a power which makes holy. Hence the priest, both as the representative to man of a holy God and as the representative of man in his relations with God, is especially associated with holiness. He bears a priesthood which is holy. He is called, beyond others, to a personal holiness in correspondence with his holy functions.

What is holiness ? To attempt to answer the question at all fully would be to undertake a very great task. For in God holiness is nothing less than the sum-total of his attributes, thus, of course, transcending all human knowledge ; while in man holiness is the quality by which he resembles God, reflecting in himself the divine perfections. All enunciation of high ideals of the priestly life necessarily involves developing in positive directions this conception of holiness. We may be content here to begin with the most primary and fundamental meaning of the word in the history of human thought and language. In this primary sense the word is rather negative than positive : it involves an "aloofness" or "separateness." And this idea of holiness as aloofness, connected with the primary revelation of the Fall, of sin as a fact, gives us the fundamental conception of holiness as a dissociation from sin. God is holy, as hating sin, and seeing in it the contradiction of himself. Man is holy as renouncing sin, finding deliverance from it, working against its energies, counteracting it. However much the Christian content of holiness may be enlarged in a positive direction, this primary negative meaning remains basic. The Law, emphasizing the horror of sin, elaborated the Jewish sacrifice of propitiation to express alike the holiness of God offended by sin, and the holiness in man which sought to placate him. The Christian Liturgy is, as we have seen, the Christian sin-offering, embodying the same aspect of worship, moving in the same circle of ideas. And here, as in all else, the Liturgy faithfully reflects the Christian life of which it is the summary and formal expression. Repentance is fundamental to Christianity: the entrance into life is a "death unto sin," and this not merely as an episode, but as the beginning of a life-long renunciation of evil. The circle of ideas which belongs to the sin-offering meets us again and again in the description of the attitude of the Christian to life: the idea of death as the penalty for sin, and a mystic dying as the escape from sin. "Dead with Christ,"[1] "baptized into his death,"[2] the Christian is to "mortify" his members upon earth.[3] The symbolic death at the font is represented again and again at the altar, the mystic counterpart of the brazen altar of the Jews and the Cross its antitype, since upon it is set forth "the Lamb as it had been slain," the body broken, the blood shed, so that again and again the Christian unites himself with the death of Christ as the condition of sharing his life. From the days of the catacombs, moreover, the altar has been a tomb, covering the relics of the living dead, and proclaiming the law of life through death.

This aspect of Christianity as a dying life, a mortification,

[1] Col. ii. 20.

[2] Rom. vi. 3.

[3] Col. iii. 5.

a perpetuation of the sufferings of Christ, which is to find representative expression in those who are especially the representatives of the Christian religion, may be roughly summed up in the one word penance. The priest is called, as such, to do penance. And this doing penance is to be both individual and representative, for his own sins and for the sins of the people. "He ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins."[1] This he does in the Liturgy: this he is to do in his liturgical life, which will be characterized by the energies of penance.

These energies find formal expression in the sacrament of penance, which fixes upon the confession of sin as a central point, involving interior energies of self-examination and contrition to precede it, and exterior energies of satisfaction to follow it. The penitent confessing his sin has already judged himself, examining the record of his conscience and condemning his sin. He comes to confession prepared to accept a penance by which he shall make satisfaction to the offended majesty of God. The three stages thus embodied, of repentance in thought, word, and deed, must find representative expression in the life of the priest, and we may proceed to examine them singly in this connection.

i. *Self-examination and contrition.*

"Let a man examine himself,"[2] writes St. Paul. This self-examination is insisted on as a necessary preparation for communion. And the fact that the priest's communion is not only an individual but a representative action would of itself be sufficient ground for insisting on the special importance of self-examination in his case. Daily self-examination is inculcated upon the devout laity: the priest cannot be satisfied with less frequency, and more searching examination may reasonably be expected from him. Since the ordinary

[1] Heb. v. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 28.

Christian daily asks himself, How have I sinned to-day in thought, word, deed, omission ? more than this will surely be incumbent upon the priest. In his ordinary general self-examination at night, he will make a thorough and searching enquiry into his conduct during the past day. He will consider carefully not only how far he has committed definite sins, or failed in clear duties ; but how far he has come short of the glory of God in a life which was meant to be in its every energy a ministry to him. Did he begin the day with the firm intention of glorifying God, and has this motive dominated his activities ? Have his actions been performed with a right interior spirit, with a careful attention to their exterior elaboration ? Has he been throughout, like a priest at the altar, ministering *attente*, *intente* and *devote* to God ? Or has he, for a moment or an hour, fallen back into a life at all haphazard, blindly following his own desires or instincts ? Dissipation and distraction are besetting dangers of the priest's life in the world, hindering his ministry no less really than slovenliness and wandering thoughts at the altar. Day by day, let the priest ask himself how far he has yielded to (a) idle thoughts, taking his mind away from its necessary preoccupation, the service of God, (b) useless desires, weakening the supremely important desire to find in the service and possession of God the realization of all his hopes, (c) needless anxieties, hindering him from resting utterly on the power of God sustaining him and working by him.

This daily detailed self-examination is undoubtedly difficult. It is made unnecessarily difficult by the common fault of leaving it till late in the day, when mind and body are often weary and the faculties unequal to much effort. It is of real importance to the priest to find time for his evening prayers before he is too tired by the work of the day to make the effort which they require.

Most priests will find that the evening self-examination needs to be supplemented and simplified by a brief period of recollection in the middle of the day, when the use of the preceding hours may be briefly reviewed, the intention renewed, and the rest of the day dedicated anew to God's service. This makes the evening examen a much easier matter.

But even the devout laity are in many cases not satisfied with a daily general self-examination. They make in addition a special examen of conscience at some time in the day, with regard to their besetting sin, or the virtue they are especially endeavouring to acquire. And if the laity can feel the need of special examen of this kind, the priest should surely feel still more need of it. His more searching self-examination should issue in a more detailed self-knowledge, impressing vividly upon him the points at which he fails and to which special effort must be directed. The special examen, noting with care the number of times a special fault has occurred, or the opportunities of practising a needed virtue been neglected, and renewing the resolution of amendment, is best made at mid-day and combined with a brief general review of conduct during the day: and the evening examination is thus prepared for and rendered easier.

Priests may very profitably adopt for this purpose what is called self-examen by way of meditation.[1] Let us suppose that the particular examen is to be made on humility. The meditation will be made on this subject. The supreme condescension of God may be first considered and adored: the self-humiliation of the Eternal Word in the Incarnation: the humility of Mary, which co-operated to the realization of the divine plan: the lowliness of the Sacred Heart: the humility shown by our Lord in his ministry to man, and so on. Thus the priest may excite in himself the love of humility. He may consider the ugliness of pride, as shown by the enemy of God and man, and trace this ugly thing in his own thoughts, words, and actions, abhorring it and expressing his contrition for it. The meditation will always issue in self-examination followed by acts of contrition and definite resolutions of amendment.

---

[1] "A sort of meditation intermingled with affections, of contrition especially, and with petitions and resolutions." Lehodey, *Ways of Mental Prayer.*

Self-examination will, of course, always be followed by acts of contrition. The knowledge of sin profits little apart from the loving sorrow for it which issues in the firm purpose of amendment. Always important, contrition will be emphasized in the preparation for sacramental confession. It is recorded of a servant of God that always before confession he made four stations. First, he cast himself down in spirit at the feet of God, considering how by his sin he had offended the divine Goodness, and bewailing his sin on this account. Secondly, he set himself in spirit among the hosts of the Blessed in Heaven, considering their endless and inexhaustible joy and felicity, and pondering on the horror of the sin that had incurred the loss of such bliss. Thirdly, he visited in like manner the damned in hell, meditating on their sufferings and grieving for the sin that had merited a similar condition of eternal torment. Lastly, he cast himself down at the foot of the Cross, seeing how his sin had made the Son of God suffer. These four stations involve the basing of penitence on motives of varying value, yet all worth cultivating.

ii. *The use of the Sacrament of Penance.*

The sinner, offering for sin, was required by the old law to confess his sin, whether he were one of the people, or a priest. And confession remains the law of the new covenant, as of the old, for the sinner. The need and value of what is called going to confession must be taken for granted here. The laity, in increasing numbers in England, as very commonly elsewhere, practise a frequent recourse to the Sacrament of Penance, and with great profit to their spiritual development. It is obvious that a higher standard in this matter is to be expected from priests than from the laity. In view of his occupation, the priest is called to the diligent use of all that makes for cleanness of soul: he is bound by the injunction, "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord."[1] And his representative character makes the priest's sin more grievous and his need of penance greater, both on this account and also on account of his obligation to do penance for others.

Bearing this in mind, it is well to face the practical question, How often should priests go to confession? Of course, the priest will go to confession at once if he should have fallen into mortal sin, or anything approaching mortal sin. This is in truth what every Christian should be expected to do before approaching the altar. But beyond this necessary use of Penance as the divinely ordained remedy for grievous sin after baptism, we find in modern times what may be called the ascetic use of this sacrament, not merely as a remedy for mortal sin, but as a means of growth in holiness. Thus many devout persons who seldom or never fall into mortal sin go to confession monthly, fortnightly, or even weekly. In any instructed congregation there will be found those who go quite frequently to confession and who are obviously benefited by doing so. For the priest whose parishioners go at frequent intervals to be content himself to go perhaps half a dozen times in the year, or even less often, invites a comparison between the standards of the layman and the priest which is all on the wrong side. In the Roman Church, where the traditions of the priestly life have not been lost, as they have been among us, weekly confession for priests is quite common, with an interval of about fifteen days as the maximum, while a very usual and commendable rule is that of weekly confession, with a more detailed confession monthly.

A guiding principle which may usefully be borne in mind in making a rule as to frequency of confession is that the ascetic use of the Sacrament of Penance is prophylactic as well as remedial. It purifies the soul from stain, clearing the spiritual vision, and imparting sanctifying grace to enable the life to be kept up to a high standard. As soon as the renewing effect of one confession is beginning to wear off; as soon as the spiritual life shows signs of "running down," then it is advisable to go again.

---

[1] Isa. lii. 11.

On the whole, it is much to be desired that we could secure a general practice among priests of fortnightly confession, with a positive rule of not going more than three weeks unconfessed.

Certainly it may be confidently stated that a due attention on the part of priests to the practice of searching examen of conscience, on the lines indicated, would develop that higher standard of priestly purity of life which is our great need, and lead to an increased frequency of confession.

One last word may be said about the priest's confessions. His sense of personal sin will be a constant motive to confession. But it will not be his only motive. When he sorrows, as a good priest cannot fail to do, over the sins of others, and especially of those who are committed to his charge, and for whom he must answer, a right instinct will lead him to go to confession and offer his act of penance for them. He will not lightly be able to divest himself even of the feeling of guilt at the sins of others which a higher standard of holiness in himself might have done much to render impossible; and, apart from this, he will feel concern at the offended majesty of God, wronged by his children, and will hasten to make such reparation to him as he may. As members one of another, we are all concerned in each others' sins. We help to create the atmosphere in which sin is easily engendered. No one can divest himself entirely of responsibility; and especially is this true of the priest, who can do so much to make or mar the ideals of others, while it is his especial business to make reparation, not for his own sins alone, but for those of the people.

iii. *Doing penance.*

The element of reparation, expiation, satisfaction for sin, which by a deeply rooted human instinct is a part of true repentance, is provided for in the formal ministry of the Sacrament of Penance by what is called strictly the "penance," a task imposed by the confessor and voluntarily accepted by the penitent, to be performed by him as an earnest of his desire to make reparation for his sin.

And here we may note that the energies of penitence in the Christian life become inevitably something more than a negative attitude of the soul towards sin. They are a positive worship of the holiness, the mercy and the justice of Almighty God. The soul condemns sin because it displeases the holiness of God, confesses its guilt in its appeal to His mercy, does penance in acknowledgment of his supreme justice which demands alike that good deeds shall be rewarded and that sins shall be punished.

The Church's doctrine of satisfaction is strictly parallel to her doctrine of merit. Fallen humanity can of itself neither merit by its works God's rewards, nor satisfy by its penalties his justice. Fallen away from God, it is, as it were, out of court: its energies have no value to please or appease him. What fallen man could not do, the Son of God became man to do. His life and death were of infinite value in the sight of God, both to win his rewards and to satisfy his justice. But the work of Christ did not end with his work for us. It was not enough that he should merit for us and satisfy for us: he must also merit and satisfy in us. In other words, the Church is the medium by which our Lord continues his work on earth. In this, his mystical body, he still pleases the Father and merits in his members and for them the rewards of the Divine Goodness: still makes expiation, in and through his members, to the justice of God, outraged by sin.

Thus it is that those who are in a state of grace, in living union with God in Christ, are enabled by works of penance to satisfy the justice of God; able to expiate for their own sins and the sins of others. Thus St. Paul was able to rejoice in the sufferings he endured and to offer them to God for his spiritual children, claiming that thus he could "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."[1] Like the other Apostles, he was especially called to this life of suffering, that thus he might be truly representative of Christ crucified, proclaiming him to men and continuing the energies of his life of penance; and truly representative of the Church, in which the activities of Christ are extended.

It is clear that expiation is the business of the priest. As at the altar, so in his daily life, he is called upon to make reparation to God for the sins of men. He is called upon to endure suffering and to offer it to God for this intention. In other words, the priest is called upon to practise mortification. And it is this practice of mortification that we now come to consider practically.

But a word of caution is needed first as to the proper function of mortification, and the principles which govern its practice. The object of mortification is to put to death, as the word implies, that which is evil in us. "I have no right of death," says a recent writer,[2] "over that which God has placed within me; I have only the right of life. But there is something in me which comes from me and not from God; I am a man and a sinner." And he goes on to quote St. Augustine, "A man and a sinner, two words: and in these two words there are two things, one from nature, the other from sin; one made by God, the other made by me. And I must destroy what I have made, in order that God may save what he has made."[3] God, and God alone, has the right of death over the body: and this he exercises in all that befalls us which harms the body; from the least sickness or damage to death itself. We expiate by the joyful acceptance of all that God thus inflicts upon us: but we may not ourselves wilfully harm the powers of the body. To do so is to fail to distinguish between true and false mortification. Mortification is, as the writer already quoted happily says, "to break the net and to let the bird go free, to kill the microbe and to cure the sick man, to disengage life from death": it is to break down the evil in man and to strengthen the good. With this preliminary caution as to the distinction between true and false mortification, we may go on to consider the various kinds of mortification and their place in the life of the priest.

---

[1] Col. i. 24.

[2] Tissot, *The Interior Life*, p. 261.

[3] St. Augustine, on Ps. xliv. 18.

Mortifications are best classified according to the element in them of human choice. This enables us to divide them roughly into three classes. First, those in the incidence of which there is no element of human choice; secondly, those which have an element of human choice, since they arise out of action which is chosen; thirdly, those which are initiated by human choice, being wholly voluntary. Before examining these three kinds of mortifications singly, it must be insisted that the value of all mortification as penance, expiating for sin and satisfying the justice of God, depends upon *the concurrence in it of the will of God and the human will.* It is peculiarly important to bear this in mind in relation to the first and last classes of mortification. The mortifications which God in his divine Providence lays upon us *ab extra* need to be sanctified by the joyful concurrence of the human will in bearing them. The mortifications voluntarily adopted by the individual need to be sanctified by the will of God approving them.

I. Involuntary Sufferings

First, then, let us consider the large class of mortifications which are wholly involuntary. They come upon us from without, quite apart from our own volition. Such are the hosts of little inconveniences which meet us in life through the untowardness of circumstances or the inconsiderateness of other people. It is well to note these little inconveniences which, no less than grievous pain, severe illness and death itself, are part of the ordering of God's Providence. They very readily become occasions of sin, sins of impatience or even of anger, harming the priest's soul and disedifying others. Their value as affording opportunity for expiation is far too seldom realized. Let it be strongly insisted that, just as our chief opportunities of serving God are to be found, not in exceptional or striking actions, but in the performance of quite ordinary actions for him; so our chief opportunities of bearing the cross of expiation are to be sought, not in exceptional sufferings, but in the cheerful endurance of ordinary inconveniences for love of God.

Many people are spared grave suffering or sickness for years together, or even a life-time; while little inconveniences are the lot of all. But the principles which govern the use of these smaller ills are the same as those which govern the use of far greater afflictions. And the due use of them is, like the patient bearing of sickness, a preparation for that last great mortification of death.

The great point about this first class of sufferings is to make them voluntary. They have the one element of the Divine Will, since they come upon us by the ordering of God's Providence. It is ours to add to them the element of their acceptance by the human will. It is the more necessary to do this, since they often come upon us unexpectedly, take us by surprise, and lead us to yield to the natural human instinct of resenting them, rather than to the supernatural spirit which sees in them a cross to be embraced. Let us then summarize under four headings the practices which will enable us to make use of involuntary sufferings and impart to them an expiatory value.

(i.) The priest will cultivate a readiness to bear such suffering as the good Providence of God may lay upon him by frequent *self-oblation for suffering.* He will embrace these sufferings beforehand, in the same way that he sanctifies his actions beforehand by the good intention. This will do something to prevent his being surprised, or, worse, betrayed into sin, when he encounters what is naturally repugnant to him.

(ii.) When inconvenience or suffering comes, the priest will cultivate the habit of *instant and thankful acceptance.* The natural tendency, under such circumstances, is to yield to self-pity. And the priest, recognizing this, must at all costs put away self-pity, as a form of self-love most weakening and ruinous to the soul. As self-love, in the form of self-complacency, can take all the savour out of our good works, so, in the form of self-pity, can it take all the merit out of our sufferings. Hence we should at once remind ourselves of the great goodness of God, who punishes us much less than we deserve, and allows us, as it were, to compound for the greater punishment which our sins have deserved, by the cheerful endurance of trifling ills: himself putting before us the opportunities of penance which is easy and efficacious. *My God, I thank thee for this inconvenience, this suffering. This, and far more than this, have my sins deserved. Yet this I bear gladly, and will bear, for love of thee.* Such will be the tenor of the priest's attitude to his daily sufferings.

(iii.) The priest will do well to connect these involuntary sufferings with the thought of *preparation for death.* All suffering is the penalty of sin, and is thus connected with the supreme divinely appointed penalty of death. The little inflictions which God lays upon us are a preparation for the supreme infliction. The use of the little penances prepares us to use aright, by an attitude of joyful acceptance, the last supreme penance of death. So the priest will often say in effect, *My God, I must suffer, and I must die, for I have sinned. Help me so to embrace this suffering for love of thee, that I may be aided thereby to prepare for death.*

(iv.) Lastly, the priest will *associate himself with*

Christ in suffering. As he offers his actions to God with those of our Lord, so he will offer his sufferings with those of Christ. For all the value of his sufferings is due to his union with Christ: the secret of merit in both action and suffering lies in the truth that it is Christ who in us[1] both works and suffers, merits from the Goodness of God the reward we could not merit, meets the Justice of God with a satisfaction we could not offer.

II. SUFFERINGS PARTLY VOLUNTARY

This class of sufferings consists of those afflictions which come upon us by our own choice, and yet are not chosen in themselves, but rather necessarily incurred as the known result of actions or a course of action chosen by us.

First of all in this class of sufferings we may place those sufferings which arise out of the performance of a duty. Let us take as one of the simplest instances the observance of a fast or day of abstinence. Here our choice is exerted not directly to inflict upon ourselves a privation. Our choice is to obey the law of the Church, and this involves, as a known consequence, a privation not chosen for its own sake.

Or again, the priest is called upon to minister the sacraments under surroundings which involve discomfort, danger, or even almost certain death. Here the choice is to perform a duty: the suffering is accepted as a necessary or possible consequence. So far the cases are very little removed from those in which suffering is wholly involuntary. A duty is imposed and, so far as it is a clear duty for us, we are bound to undertake it, with the suffering following as a consequence. But in many cases the inconvenience, or positive suffering, is the result of action which is not a clear duty, or not a duty at all. As, for instance, when a priest gives up rest or puts himself to inconvenience or suffering, for the sake of doing a kindness which he is not obliged to do; or even incurs some degree of discomfort or pain for the sake of doing something that gives him enjoyment.

---

[1] cp. Col. i. 27.

Here it will be seen that both terms are in question. God's will is not certain, unless it be in the performance of a duty laid upon us. Even in the case of fasting, it may not be God's will that I should fast, at the cost of being incapacitated for another task. The duty must be made perfectly clear. Provided this is so, then the suffering must be accepted, and the same principles applied as in the first class of afflictions laid upon us by God. Where there is no clear duty, it is obvious that the will accepts the sufferings, which it could easily decline and does not. It may be quite lawful to choose to undergo certain sufferings, as the cost of certain actions which are lawful, and possibly pleasurable, but not imposed. Only here the question needs to be carefully asked, whether it is in accordance with God's will, in each particular case. We need, that is, to apply the same principles as in the third class of sufferings, those which are wholly voluntary. If it may safely be presumed that a particular action involving some suffering is in accordance with the will of God, then that suffering can be sanctified and offered to him as expiation.

III. Sufferings Wholly Voluntary

Much of the suffering of Christians is wholly voluntary, being self-inflicted for the purpose of doing penance and delivering the soul from the power of sin. So men deny themselves in various ways, going without this or that luxury, mortifying this or that taste. Such voluntary mortifications are usually divided into *ordinary* and *extraordinary* mortifications. Ordinary mortifications, such as are quite common among Christians, excite no particular notice or comment, and in no way injure the health. Extraordinary mortifications are such as are less common, make for singularity, and may possibly injure the health. The use of the discipline, the wearing of a hair shirt, sleeping on the floor, and so on, are to be reckoned as extraordinary mortifications.

In the case of these voluntary mortifications, what is of supreme importance is to be sure that they are the will of God for us. All our penances must in one way or another come from God, either by the action of his providence, or the guidance of the Holy Ghost. It is very necessary to insist on this. It is quite possible for mortifications to proceed from the human spirit, from a desire to prove to ourselves that we are spiritual, to flatter a spiritual pride, or some other merely human motive. Such mortifications will be positively mischievous.

There is no specific practice to be enjoined upon the priest in the matter of his choice of mortifications. It must be governed by the general practice which is essential to all acts of choice on his part. In what he chooses to suffer, as in what he chooses to do, the priest needs to depend utterly upon the Spirit of Counsel. He needs an especial devotion to the Holy Ghost, whose power with him and energies in him constitute his life a ministry. He will often pray for his guidance, with the words *Veni Creator Spiritus* on his lips. And so far as he keeps his conscience clean, and his intention single, he may rely on the fulfilment of the promise, "Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it."[1] This inner guidance will lead him in the matter of voluntary penances as in the matter of voluntary actions. But something more must be said. The reliance on the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the Church involves a recognition of the divine method of ministering to man through man. It is an absolute principle of the spiritual life that no important action should be taken without seeking the guidance of a competent spiritual adviser. Applied to mortifications, this involves the necessity of recourse to a director where any extraordinary mortification is contemplated, or even any ordinary mortification where there exists any reasonable doubt as to its desirability in the individual case. The permission of the director must be regarded as absolutely essential in all such cases.

---

[1] Isa. xxx. 21.

It is hardly necessary to add that mortifications should be practised with the utmost secrecy. The delicate instincts of a true spirituality invariably cherish this secrecy. Our penances are for the eye of God alone.

On the fruits of mortification in the life of a priest, a volume might be written. The objects of the priest's energies of penance are twofold, "as for the people, so also for himself." And the results correspond. Both the people and the priest himself are the gainers when the priest mortifies himself.

St. Paul rejoiced in his sufferings, bearing them for the sake of the Church. He knew, assuredly, that they called down the grace of God, obtaining conversions and manifold gifts to satisfy the spiritual needs of men. All true cross-bearing has in it this power of gaining grace from God for others, since it is, in a very real sense, an extension of Calvary. And saintly priests have grasped the value of mortification as an instrument to be used for the conversion and edification of those committed to their charge. The holy Curé d'Ars, the most successful parish priest whose life is at all fully known, offered his penances to God for his spiritual children, and his life was one of incredible austerities. But he converted every soul in his parish and ministered to countless numbers from outside it. It is related of him that when a priest came to him, sad at heart at his failure to convert those with whom he laboured, he asked him, "Have you fasted for them ? Scourged yourself ? Spent nights in prayer ?" And the priest himself gains. His supreme object must be to form in himself the priestly character. And three fundamental virtues of this character have their roots in the energies of penance. The first is contrition. Sinful man can only approach God with the "broken and contrite heart." It is fitting that the priest should especially embody this condition, since he is especially called to approach God for man. And contrition can exist in many degrees: it is capable of being deepened as love of God and hatred for sin are deepened. With the deepening of contrition comes a corresponding increase in interior purity, with the clearness of vision and delicacy of spiritual touch which belong to it. David, setting his sin "ever before him," could claim a progressive cleansing: *amplius lava me.* So the priest who daily mourns for sin and does penance for it, daily grows in the holiness which is based on a right attitude to sin, and in the knowledge and power which belong to this holiness.

Secondly, mortification increases humility. It is a commonplace of the spiritual life that it is impossible to grow in humility without the acceptance of humiliations. All humiliations are mortifications, and the greater number of mortifications are humiliations. This is especially true of those inflicted upon us from without, and lends them an especial value. And the value of humility cannot possibly be over-emphasized. It is the foundation on which God builds. Until there is the humility to support his graces, he withholds them. The fundamental necessity of penance may be gauged by the fundamental necessity of the humility which is fed by it.

Thirdly, penance brings the fruit of detachment. This again is fundamental to the priestly character. It corresponds with the office of the priest as one set apart from men for the service of God, one whose face is turned from earth towards heaven, and who needs therefore a holy indifference to things earthly, as the basis for a growth in the knowledge of heavenly things. The priest must especially represent the Christian attitude which has its "conversation in heaven," the very antithesis of the temper of those "who mind earthly things."[1] So he will pray: *Da mihi, dulcissime Jesu, cor liberum, quod nulla sibi vindicet violenta delectatio.*[2] And he will mortify the avenues of earthly pleasures that, growing in detachment from them, he may reap the spiritual joy which grows out of detachment.

---

[1] Phil. iii. 19, 20.

[2] Prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The whole object of the priest's ministry is to please God. And this he can do by what he does for him, and what he suffers for him. Action and suffering are apportioned to each in varying proportions by God's providence. But suffering has a peculiar value as being more favourable to humility than action, and in some degree it is essential for all Christians. The priest especially, as the representative of him who was made "perfect through sufferings,"[1] must seek to welcome suffering. In his life as in the liturgy, he is to drink of the Lord's cup, and to find it "the cup of salvation."[2]

---

[1] Heb. ii. 10; cp. 1 Pet. v. 10.

[2] Ps. cxvi.

CHAPTER VII

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE

θυσία αἰνέσεως

THE Jewish burnt-offering, which we now come to consider, will be seen to emphasize a fresh aspect of sacrifice, more positive than that on which the sin-offering insisted. We shall find the same aspect embodied in the antitypal Christian Sacrifice, and in the Christian life of which it is a summary. In other words, we shall find a fresh conception of holiness, no longer merely negative, regarded in its attitude to sin, but positive, regarded in its relation to God.

The central point in the sin-offering was the sin of man. In the burnt-offering, it is the glory of God. This sacrifice is called in Hebrew the *Olah*, or "ascending sacrifice," the idea being that it was caught up to God by the fire from him which consumed it. It was also called the *whole* offering,[1] since, with the exception of the skin, which fell to the lot of the officiating priest,[2] the entire body was burnt upon the altar.

As in other sacrifices, the offerer brought the victim to the entrance of the tabernacle, mystically identified himself with it by the imposition of hands, and slew it. The blood was then poured out at the foot of the altar. It will be noted that we have here neither the confession of sins which accompanied the imposition of hands in the sin-offering, nor the special manipulation of the blood. The emphasis is reserved for the ritual action which next follows, the burning upon the altar. The priest laid in order upon the wood the head, the fat, and, after washing them in water, the inward parts and the legs.[1] These were then consumed by the holy fire, sent down from God upon Aaron's first offering and kept perpetually burning upon the altar.[2]

---

[1] Deut. xxxiii. 10; Ps. li. 19.

[2] Lev. vii. 8.

Where the sin-offering emphasized the death of the victim as a penalty for sin, a penalty paid by the offerer, mystically one with the victim, the burnt-offering rather insisted on the acceptance of the victim by God, and the acceptance with it of the worshipper, offering himself and all his powers of soul and body, as symbolized by the offering laid upon the altar, wrapped round with the golden flame, and caught up, as it were, to God.

The principal burnt-offering under the Law was that offered daily, morning and evening, for the congregation of Israel. It consisted of a lamb, offered with bread and wine.[3] Nothing was allowed to interfere with this offering, with which the altar perpetually smoked.[4] Other sacrifices were brought and laid upon it. At special times it was expanded: on the Sabbath two lambs were offered instead of one, at festivals seven lambs, and, during the feast of tabernacles, even fourteen, with bullocks and rams beside.[5]

Of the offering as consisting of a lamb, or several, and expanded by the addition at times of the bullock and the ram, Archdeacon Freeman[6] has said: "By all these was manifested the might that was veiled under the meekness of the lamb. It might be said of the God of Israel, as manifesting His power through that sacrifice, 'He had horns coming out of his hand, and there was the hiding of his power'[7]: 'His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are the horns of unicorns.'[8] There was might in that sacrifice to overcome, for the purposes of the covenant, all the powers of evil; the 'horns' of that altar were a strong refuge. In just sequence with this, 'the Lamb as it had been slain,'[9] in the Revelation, has 'seven horns,' the full mystic complement of sacrificial power; and this Lamb is also the 'Lion of the tribe of Judah, and has prevailed,' not only to redeem the world unto God, but to 'open the book,' and to achieve the final victory over 'the beast having seven heads and ten horns.'"

---

[1] Lev. i. 3–9.

[2] Lev. ix. 24, vi. 13.

[3] Exod. xxix. 38–42.

[4] ibid. Num. xxviii. 10, 15, etc.

[5] Num. xxviii. xxix.

[6] *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 40, quoted by Willis.

[7] Hab. iii. 4.

[8] Deut. xxxiii. 17.

[9] Rev. v. 6.

It is easy to see how our Lord, in the energies of his life, no less than in his death, and again, most clearly in his glorious resurrection and ascension, fulfils the type of the burnt-offering. Throughout his life he gave himself to God for us. Throughout he energized in the power of the Holy Ghost, the antitypal fire. "Through the eternal Spirit" he "offered himself without spot to God."[1] By the Spirit was he "quickened"[2] and "caught up to God and to his Throne."[3] The Father looked down upon him "well pleased"[4] in him: he was, and is, the archetypal burnt-offering "of a sweet savour unto the Lord."[5]

A word must be said, before passing on to consider the Christian Sacrifice, about the meat-offering and drink-offering, consisting of bread and wine, which formed an essential feature of the burnt-offering, and which have such an obvious significance in relation to the Christian antitype. Lightfoot[6] testifies to the Jewish tradition that the meat and drink-offering consummated the sacrifice. Only a portion of the meat-offering was burnt, the rest becoming the food of the priests, except where the burnt-offering was that of a priest, when the whole meat-offering was burnt. The portion burnt with the victim on the altar was called the "memorial" (*μνημόσυνον*) of it, a fact worth noting as bearing upon the sacrificial implications of the words of the Institution of the Eucharist.[7] With the meat-offering incense was also burnt, and the wine of the drink-offering was poured out on the sacrifice. Archdeacon Freeman[8] notices how this feature of the Jewish sacrifice is also to be found in Gentile sacrifices where "animals were never offered alone, but always with an accompaniment of flour and wine. Nor only so. The victim, though itself the efficacious element of the sacrifice, was offered *by means of the bread and wine.* The bread was broken and sprinkled on the head of the animal while alive; and again wine, with frankincense, was poured between its horns. This done, the sacrifice was conceived to have been duly offered, so far as concerned the *gift* and dedication of it on man's part, and the acceptance of it by the Deity. This is proved by the fact that *immolare*, 'to sprinkle' with the broken *mola*, or cake, was used, as is well-known, to express the *entire action of sacrifice, the slaying and burning included.* So again, *mactare*, 'to enrich or crown with the addition of wine' (*mauctus=magis auctus*), was likewise used for the whole action. This is an absolute proof of the immense virtue and the implicit power attributed to the bread and wine in these sacrifices. They were held to carry within them in a manner the whole action. The presenting of them was the presenting of the slain sacrifice, the acceptance of them was its acceptance. And that moreover, they were identified respectively, the broken bread with the body to be slain, the poured out wine with the blood to be shed, is both probable from the obvious parallel, and is countenanced by other parts of the system. Thus the poor, who could not afford slain victims, were allowed to do their part by providing cakes of bread; and those were sometimes made in the shape of the ox to be sacrificed, and might be offered alone. . . . Now all this coincides marvellously with the Mosaic provisions, by which the animal sacrifice was held to be completed when the bread-offering had been laid on, and the wine poured out[1] on, the victim;

---

[1] Heb. ix. 14.

[2] 1 Pet. iii. 18.

[3] Rev. xii. 5.

[4] Matt. iii. 17, xii. 18, xvii. 5.

[5] Lev. i. 9.

[6] *Temple Service*, chap. vii. § 2.

[7] The word translated "remembrance" is *ἀνάμνησις*. See note on p. 37.

[8] *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 75, quoted by Willis.

---

[1] cp. Ecclus. l. 15 (where, however, the drink-offering is spoken of as poured out "at the foot of the altar"), and the words of Rabanus Maurus *ad loc*: *Consummata oblatio offertur excelso regi, quando corpus Christi in sacro altari offertur Deo omnium dominatori ubi et libatio fit sanguine uvae, quando sanguis Redemptoris exhibetur in calice, quod fundendum est in fundamentum altaris, hoc est totum agendum in commemorationem nostri Redemptoris: ipse est enim fundamentum quod portat totum Ecclesiae aedificium. Cuius oblationis odor suavissimus est excelso principi, quia beneplacet ac gratissima est Deo Patri omnipotenti.*

and, again, with the Law allowing the poor to bring a bread-offering, instead of victims." The same author goes on to notice that the words *θυσία*, *θύειν*, referring strictly to the offering of incense, as *immolare* and *mactare* refer to the offering of bread and of wine, are similarly used with the meanings "a sacrifice," "to sacrifice," One more significant point in this connection may be noted. The word for the meat-offering of bread was the *minchah*. And this term was not infrequently used of the whole morning or evening sacrifice. And it is under this name that Malachi prophesies the Christian sacrifice: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering (*minchah*): for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts."[1]

The offering of himself, made by our Lord throughout his whole life, and in his death on the cross, was not only "for our sins." He was burnt-offering as well as sin-offering, not only reconciling us to God by his death, but also consecrating us to God, bringing us near in himself to God, translating us into a new life through death. This offering whereby he gave himself to God for man, to the glory of God, was summarized in the rite he ordained, when he consecrated the first Christian host and declared it to be "my body, which is given for you." The very elements of bread and wine inevitably suggested the burnt-offering, and the connection is further emphasized by the petition in the eucharistic prayer recorded in St. John xvii. that he may "glorify" the Father. The idea of frequency, especially suggested in St. Paul's account of the Institution, and associated with the Eucharist by Christian tradition ever since, is also a link with the only Old Testament sacrifice which was daily and continual.

And this aspect of the Christian Liturgy, which we can trace in its institution, which makes it the fulfilment of the old burnt-offering, an offering to God for his glory, is emphasized in every variety of the Christian rite. The Eucharist has from the first been regarded, not, as Protestantism has misconceived it, as a mere ministry to man, but as the Church's principal act of worship to God, the *sacrificium laudis*, " this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." Its central action is prefaced by the invitation to lift up the heart and praise God, the unanimous confession that it is meet and right to give him thanksgiving and praise. The very taking of the elements into the hands and the holding them up has been increasingly emphasized, but emphasized from the very first as an oblation to God. The attitude of the priest, looking towards God, mainly addressing himself to God, makes for the same constant view of the service as something primarily done for the glory of God. Like the burnt-offering, the Christian Liturgy puts in the forefront neither man's sin as the primary object insisted on, nor man's need, but God's glory. The *Gloria in excelsis*, although not found in the earlier liturgies,[1] may be said to sum up this aspect of the Eucharist. Its phrases can be paralleled from every known liturgy.

---

[1] Mal. i. 11.

But the category of ideas involved in the burnt-offering is most strikingly carried into the Christian Liturgy by the conception of it as an energy in the power of the Holy Ghost. What marked the *Olah*, the " ascending sacrifice," was the fire from God, that caught up the sacrifice to him. And of this fire the Holy Ghost is the antitype. This was eloquently put by a preacher at St. Paul's Cathedral some years ago :—

" We are called upon to say that sacrifice—the sacrifice of the Lord which is the type and only reality of all sacrifice—is not destruction, is not the passing away of the self, is not the crowding down of the feelings, is not the annulling of the will. Sacrifice does not consist—that is to say, not characteristically—in death, destruction, abolition, going out of being. In the ancient ritual it is not the knife which is characteristic of the accepted sacrifice. There are offerings in the Old Testament which have the knife, but which yet fail of being ‘most holy.’ But what marks the offering which is most holy, most acceptable, divine, absolutely God's, in ritual and type and sign? Why, not the knife, but the fire. It is the golden flame which wraps the poor dead offering, takes it up into the life of Heaven, snatches it out of sight, out of the waste of life, takes it up into an eternal continuance—I mean in ritual, symbolically—into an abiding world. And it is the antitype of all this which characterizes sacrifice. It is the Holy Ghost, the Heavenly Fire coming down from Heaven, enveloping that which might have been and now shall not be wasted because it is taken and accepted into that golden shroud of the Divine response."[1]

---

[1] Not that the *Gloria in excelsis* is a late document. In a form very like that familiar to us, it is found in the Apostolic constitutions, and phrases from it occur in quite early liturgies. But in its present form and place in the Western Mass it is a later enrichment of the rite.

Our Lord, it will be remembered, proclaimed as an essential feature of Christian worship that it should be "in spirit."[2] And it is impossible not to connect this spiritual worship with the characteristic Christian gift of the Holy Spirit. From the very beginnings of its history the Christian Liturgy has been thought of as an energy in the Holy Ghost. The congregation are enabled to take their part in view of their sanctification by the Holy Ghost in baptism. And this idea of the Holy Ghost coming down as the antitypal fire upon the offering and sanctifying it was probably in St. Paul's mind when he spoke of the "offering up" (*προσφορά*) of the Gentiles as being acceptable to God, "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."[3] None were allowed in early ages to be present throughout the Liturgy unless they had been baptized. So again with the priest. He is enabled to offer in virtue of a special consecration by the Holy Ghost. At the very opening of the transaction the presence of the Holy Ghost and his power are postulated. And when we come to the actual offering, it is God the Holy Ghost who makes the earthly elements of bread and wine to become the mystic oblation of Christ's body and blood. As every student knows, the older liturgies lay the greatest possible stress on the invocation of the Holy Ghost, the prayer, that is, that he will descend upon the gifts and transessentiate them to become the Christian victim. Thus in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom the priest prays :—

---

[1] *The Heart of Jesus.* Holy Week sermons preached by Fr. Waggett, S.S.J.E. at St. Paul's Cathedral in 1901 (S.P.C.K. 1902).

[2] John iv. 23, 24.

[3] Rom. xv. 16.

"Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set before thee, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, changing (μεταβαλὼν) them by thy Holy Spirit, so that they may become to those that partake for cleansing of soul, for remission of sins, for fellowship of thy Holy Spirit, for fulfilment of the kingdom of heaven, for confidence toward thee, and not for judgment or for condemnation."

The absence of any explicit *Epiclesis* of this kind from the Latin Liturgy of the Western Church has been accounted a grave defect from the liturgical point of view. But, needless to say, the truth embodied in the *Epiclesis* as found in the older liturgies is implicit in the Christian Liturgy under whatever rite. It is the Holy Ghost who makes the sacrifice, translating the gifts, as he has translated the offerers, both priest and people, in varying degrees, into a heavenly order, a sphere of supernatural validity.

The priest, then, coming to the Christian altar, comes to offer to God a sacrifice of praise, an offering for his great glory. The offering is accepted because it is made in the energies of the Holy Ghost, the archetypal Fire. It is he who, operating in the Church through the priest, clothes the words and actions of the service with a supernatural validity. This is true of every energy of the Eucharist. It is an act of faith, in which the people, with the priest as their representative at their head, profess their belief in divine truth. But "no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."[1] As an act of faith it is a drawing near to God, to make acceptable offering to him, to offer Christ and his mystical body in him: but that body can only be offered because it has been baptized in the flame which makes it acceptable to God. The Mass is a lifting up of human actions into the heavenly sphere: but it is only the Holy Ghost who can thus lift up earth to heaven, bring down heaven to earth.

Transubstantiation by the Holy Ghost—using the word in its philosophic sense as the equivalent of the Greek *μετουσίωσις*—may be said to be the keynote of the service throughout. Human words spoken by the lips and received by the ear, become, in virtue of a faculty implanted by the Holy Ghost, the faculty of faith, "spirit and life"[2]; the vehicles of a divine revelation, the means of supernatural illumination. Human actions, ordinary actions of daily life, performed by mortal men, become the acts of God made man, through the operation of the Holy Ghost uniting man to God in Christ. Earthly elements become by his life-giving power heavenly realities: sinful men feeding on these gifts become, by his power enabling them to assimilate their divine virtue, partakers of divine energies. They are themselves transubstantiated. As the priest of old laid on the altar the head, the inward parts and the legs of the victim, and thus offered to God the intellect, the affections and desires, and all the actions of the offerer, so in the Liturgy Christ is offered to the Father, and with and in him his members, in every action and energy of their being, "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."[3] And as the flame from God wrapped round the typical sacrifice, so the Holy Spirit of Christ, through whom he offered himself to God, wraps us round, uniting and conforming us to him, imparting to our minds the illuminations of faith, so that "we have the mind of Christ,"[4] conforming our wills to his, making us throughout a sweet savour of Christ to God. As he is, so are we by virtue of the Holy Ghost sanctifying us. As he was and is the Lamb of God, taking away the sins of the world, so we offer ourselves in him to expiate, to die to sin, doing penance for it. As he is the accepted of the Father, in whom he is well pleased, so we become "accepted in the Beloved,"[1] able to please God, to offer him an acceptable homage, to glorify him. The fire is about us[2]: we are drawn into the light ineffable: the revelations of the sanctuary come home to us: sealed books are opened, read and apprehended by spiritual faculties quickened with spiritual life. As baptism was not only a mystic death but an initiation, an enlightenment, so the Liturgy is not only a penance for sin, but a walking in the light. And thus it reflects the Christian life as a *Via Illuminativa*, a Way of Illumination. It pictures the priest as one who moves in the sanctuary of life in the character of a hierophant, an adept in a mystic knowledge, armed with mystic powers. It is this aspect of the sacerdotal life which we propose to consider in the next chapter.

---

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 3.

[2] John vi. 63.

[3] Rom. xii. 1.

[4] 1 Cor. ii. 16; cp. Rom. xii. 2.

---

[1] Ephes. i. 6.

[2] Cornelius à Lapide, in his commentary on Lev. ix. 24, quotes instances from the lives of various saints of a fire, or light, descending from above and illuminating priest and altar during the offering of the Christian sacrifice. St. Basil, e.g. *visus est sacrificans candidissimo lumine et candidatis angelis circumdari.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE ILLUMINATED LIFE

ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ

MAN was created by God for himself. This elementary Christian truth, too often forgotten, cannot be too clearly insisted upon. The whole object of man's existence is to know, love, and serve God. His whole life, and no mere portion of it, is meant to be a liturgy. It is meant to be, like the burnt-offering, " of a sweet savour unto the Lord," a life which, like that of our Lord, pleases God. The conditions of our existence on earth make it inevitable that we should distinguish the categories of religious and secular energies, of prayer and work. But the categories bring their danger. Like all mental analyses, they are too coarse and crude for the realities they strive to express. In the ideal life of heaven, worship and work, like action and rest, are unified. Man is always there both energizing towards God and resting in him, both worshipping and working. It is a supreme merit of the Christian Liturgy that, like the life of heaven, it unifies, as we have seen, these energies, too easily regarded as distinct. It shows us how actions can be prayer, and how prayer can interpenetrate work. It is for this reason, surely, that when St. John, in the Revelation, seeks to picture the life of heaven, he is led to do so in liturgical terms. The life of heaven is described as an endless Mass, with the redeemed now prostrate before God and the Lamb, now following the Lamb in procession, now moving about the sanctuary in the energies of its service.

This life of heaven, pictured in the Liturgy, is the ideal which the Christian life must seek to realize under earthly conditions. As we have seen, our Lord did realize it. The ordinary Christian is bound to this life of continual service, of pleasing God. The priest is especially bound to it, as the representative of Christ to the faithful and as the representative of the Christian people before God.

The life of heaven is constantly described in terms of light. It is the life of the Vision, where the blessed see God face to face, and walk in the light of his countenance. And the life of the Christian on earth is no less truly, although in a different degree, a "walking in the light." In other words, the Christian life postulates a special knowledge, a knowledge of God, without which it is impossible to please him. Not that Christianity is primarily a knowledge, a philosophy, or a creed. It is primarily a life, a relation to Christ; but it is a life based on a creed, a relation in which every part of the man, his intellect included, is concerned. There is then a necessary knowledge on which the Christian life is based. And the priest, as a representative, in a special sense, of Christianity, is called upon to specialize in this necessary knowledge. The Liturgy, as we have seen, while postulating a certain knowledge in all who come to take part in it, postulates a special knowledge in the priest who celebrates, and this special knowledge is of the essence of priesthood, as we study it in Christ.

We saw that the perfection of our Lord's life as a liturgy, a ministration to God, inevitably involves a belief in his perfect knowledge of the will of God. This will he translated into action, reading it and obeying it as the priest reads from the altar book and carries out its directions. We saw that his human knowledge, as distinct from his divine Omniscience, was twofold, the knowledge which he acquired by the channels of the senses, and the infused knowledge which was his by the action of the Holy Ghost, dwelling in him in the fulness of his sevenfold gift. It is important to recall this distinction here. For our study of the priest's life leads us at this point to consider the knowledge required by the priest if his daily life is to be a walking in the light. And this essential knowledge is also twofold : acquired by the intellect as a result of reading and experience ; infused by grace as the result of the co-operation of the human will with the sanctifying energies of the Holy Ghost. We must guard ourselves here, as so often in making quite necessary distinctions, against making an absolute separation between the two kinds of knowledge. In the acquisition by study of the knowledge essential to the priest, spiritual gifts are very really concerned. He must study the Scriptures, for instance, but he cannot hope to understand them without an inward illumination. Again, in those spiritual exercises by which he seeks to grow in the inner knowledge of God he will not be able to dispense ordinarily with the use of the intellect in quite normal processes of thought. It is enough to say that the two kinds of knowledge, interwoven the one with the other, are both necessary, and that the one depends largely upon the priest's studies, the other largely upon his meditations. It is obvious that the priest must both study and meditate. Unfortunately, it is only possible to consider these two energies, so closely interwoven, one at a time. Their relation one to another may be aptly illustrated in words of Ecclesiasticus which admirably describe the priest's life from its intellectual side.

" He that giveth his mind to the law of the most high, and is occupied in the meditation thereof, will seek out the wisdom of all the ancient, and be occupied in prophecies. He will keep the sayings of the renowned men : and where subtil parables are, he will be there also. He will seek out the secrets of grave sentences, and be conversant in dark parables. . . . He will give his heart to resort early to the Lord that made him, and will pray before the most High, and will open his mouth in prayer, and make supplication for his sins. When the great Lord will, he shall be filled with the spirit of understanding : he shall pour out wise sentences, and give thanks unto the Lord in his prayer. He shall direct his counsel and knowledge, and in his secrets shall he meditate. He shall show forth that which he hath learned, and shall glory in the law of the covenant of the Lord."[1]

The priest's lips are to "keep knowledge,"[2] this twofold knowledge gained by study and meditation, by a study interpenetrated with the spiritual activities of meditation, a meditation which employs the intellectual activities and utilizes the knowledge they have gained. Prayer will precede study, meditation will presuppose it.

And both alike will aim at a knowledge primarily of God himself. That this knowledge of God is the primary necessity is an inevitable corollary from the fact that God is the supreme Object of man's existence and of all creation. All has been made for God. "For thy pleasure they are and were created."[3] Hence the position assigned by the Christian civilization of the middle ages to Theology as the queen of the sciences. If all things have a relation to God, existing by his Will and for him, the knowledge of God is the first essential to the knowledge of anything else in the world. It was the fatuous logic of a disbelieving Protestantism which issued in Pope's lines:

> Know thou thyself, presume not God to scan.
> The proper study of mankind is man.

Since God created man for himself, the knowledge of God is essential to any profitable knowledge of man. And this knowledge of God can never be merely intellectual. Fallen human nature cannot compass it, save by the power of grace and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Even unfallen humanity needed a power from God, involved in the gift of original righteousness. Apart from this gift it had the capacity for this knowledge, but a capacity unable to realize itself: organs with which to apprehend God, but organs requiring to be energized: an eye, as it were, yet not sight.

---

[1] Ecclus. xxxix.
[2] Mal. ii. 7.
[3] Rev. iv. 11.

With this preliminary principle laid down, we may go on to consider the priest's studies, in the order of their importance. It is quite impossible to do more within the compass of this book than glance at the various departments of necessary knowledge, and indicate roughly their relation to the priest's life. Any full consideration of them would furnish matter for a treatise or even a library.

(i.) *Dogmatic Theology.* There can be no hesitation about putting this first. The priest's first and most essential business is to know the truth about God. It is by this truth that he must live, and aid others to live. It is the very groundwork of his life as a Christian and a priest. It should hardly be necessary here to correct the error of the ignorant which supposes such knowledge to be gained primarily by study of the sacred Scriptures. It is a fact of history that the Scriptures were addressed to those who already had a knowledge of God by revelation, and not for the purpose of instructing in this knowledge those who were without it: it is a fact of experience that the study of the Bible cannot be relied on to produce, by itself, a right knowledge of revealed truth. The truth about God is taught by the supreme Teacher, the great Prophet, working in the Church which is his body. The Christian faith postulates as essential faith in the Holy Catholic Church. For it is only by accepting what the whole Church teaches that we can be sure of a right belief. The Church is guided by the Holy Ghost, the one Spirit indwelling the one body.[1] United to her Head she has "the mind of Christ."[2] The knowledge of her system of truth is the necessary key to the interpretation of Scripture. Even the Christian layman needs a simple and elementary knowledge of this system, and the possession of this knowledge is made a condition, ordinarily, of his admission to Christian privileges. Before he is confirmed and admitted to communion, he must know and understand the Creed. He may not even receive absolution from his sins without the reasonable certainty that he knows the "four great truths." The priest, even apart from his office as a teacher of the faith, might be expected to have a thorough knowledge of revealed truth as systematized by Christian theology. His position as a teacher, added to his representative position as a professor of religion, makes such knowledge an imperative necessity. And of all the abuses which have unhappily flourished in the English Church the greatest is the ignorance, on the part of a very great number of the clergy, of the Christian theology to which they stand committed. Almost every heresy known to history, and some possibly quite original, may be heard from our pulpits. Even bishops may be found who are amazingly ignorant on points of theology which might be grasped by the study of fairly elementary handbooks. This painful state of things is a matter of common knowledge, and little is to be gained by dwelling on it. But it makes it all the more imperative to insist on the importance of a real study of Catholic theology.[1] And it makes it also necessary to add a warning against a good deal of what is called Anglican theology. England, since the Reformation as before it, has had theologians of whom any nation might justly be proud. But unfortunately England has also been, and in an increasing degree, the home of amateurishness in many departments. In no other sphere has this amateurishness been more evident or damaging than in that of religion. Every year sees a host of books written on religious subjects, dealing glibly with matters of Christian faith or practice on the basis of an utterly inadequate knowledge of the science involved. Dignitaries who have never read, or have but partially read, the great Fathers of East and West and St. Thomas cheerfully spin modern "views" and repeat ancient sophisms which these Fathers and great mediæval theologians demolished. Popular preachers garnish with a fluent rhetoric the shallowest of commonplaces side by side with the most facile perversions of theological truth and the complete absence of anything like a definite system of religious belief. Matters of theological opinion are supposed to be matters of faith, while matters of faith are treated as affording scope for originality of opinion. It follows that it is waste of time for a priest to read a great deal of modern theological literature so-called. Even in reading the greater theologians of the English Church it is sometimes necessary to make allowances for a certain insularity of outlook. Generally speaking, it may be laid down that no theological writer is to be relied upon who treats the English Church as if she were a separate religious community, with a doctrine and theology of her own. The truth of God has been committed to the Catholic Church: there is no English monopoly: doctrines which are peculiarly and distinctively "Anglican" are obviously not Catholic. As opinions, where the matter is one of opinion and not of faith, they may have some value; but even as opinions the fact that they are often unrelated to any coherent system of doctrine tends to rob them of value. It must also be remembered that doctrines peculiarly and distinctively "Roman" are obviously not Catholic. Here again as opinions they may have their value, and very often great weight must be attached to them on account of their inherent reasonableness. But there are very great theologians who have to be read with caution on the matter of the constitution of the Church, as standing committed to the defence of unhistorical claims repudiated by the East and part of the West.

---

[1] Ephes. iv. 4.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 16.

---

[1] The dangers arising from the inadequate training of the English clergy have often been pointed out. Bishop Creighton used to say that we ought to pay attention to the danger of a lack of philosophical training in the English Church generally. And Professor Swete writes in his latest book (*The Holy Catholic Church*): "What is needed at the present moment is not greater intellectual activity, but greater self-restraint and more patience in investigating, a wholesome respect for traditional views, and the sobriety of judgment which refuses to publish to the world hasty statements in regard to questions that cannot be settled without long examination."

Obviously what is to be expected of the priest is that he should know what is of faith, by the teaching of East and West, on theological matters, and what is not. Where the Church has not committed the faithful to any precise definition, he should know what is the trend of the most reliable theology. This much might be attained by a study of good manuals, and it would be something if this minimum of study could be assured. But it may well be urged that, since intelligent lay folk may be expected to read manuals, some study of treatises may be expected of the clergy. The *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the masterpiece of mediæval Western theology, inheriting the patristic tradition and building on it, might well be regarded by priests as an indispensable possession, for constant reference and study.[1] With this, some acquaintance with the early history of Christian doctrine, the contributions of the great fathers and the decisions of the great Councils, and a few good works[2] by more modern writers, it is possible for the priest to have a fair knowledge of this most supremely important science.

(ii.) *The Holy Scriptures.* Needless to say, the priest is called upon to study the Scriptures, and to know them. And here again, the prevalent standard among us is very low. Let any one take the trouble to read the sermons, or even the theological treatises, of any age down to the seventeenth century, and to compare them with those of our own days on the single point of use of the Holy Scriptures. It will be found that the earlier writings constantly quote from the Bible, so much so as in many cases to seem almost a mosaic of Scripture quotations. They will be found to supply abundant instances of the saying that the best commentary on the Bible is the Bible itself. The familiarity of the mediæval and post-mediæval preachers and commentators with the whole range of the sacred books was such that when they pondered on a passage in Holy Scripture all the other passages in other books which might have any bearing on its interpretation seemed naturally and inevitably to rise to their minds. Similarly with any

[1] Dr. Temple, successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, found time to read the *Summa* twice throughout.

[2] Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* and Wilberforce's two treatises, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* and *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, are invaluable and too little known.

point of doctrine: they seemed to appreciate at once the bearing upon it of the most obscure texts. This was due, undoubtedly in part, to the constant reading of Holy Scripture in the divine office. But it was also due to the habit of a constant study of the Bible with the patristic writings which appealed at every turn to it. Such study has been the regular tradition of the Church throughout, and there is abundant testimony that the English Church clung, through her most troubled period, to this tradition. For the fact must never be lost sight of that Holy Scripture is the Word of God. The Holy Spirit is its author. And the Holy Spirit, indwelling the Church, imparts to her doctors the spiritual gifts by which alone his meaning can be interpreted. It is necessary to insist on this, in view of a modern method of exegesis, essentially rationalistic, which fixes attention on the human authors of the various books, and their circumstances; relies on human intellect rather than on spiritual gifts, on acute criticism rather than on devout study of Christian tradition, and tends, so far as it makes its way, entirely to undermine the authority of the Bible. It is much to be wished that some scholar with the necessary qualifications—and they are rarely to be found: Dr. Neale could have done it, and perhaps no other in his time or since—would write a history of Biblical exegesis, tracing it from its beginnings in Holy Scripture itself, through the Fathers and the Schoolmen, and exhibiting the rise, at the Reformation, of a wholly alien method, animated by a different temper, partial and partisan in character and ultimately destructive of that which at first it claimed to revere as the Word of God. Meanwhile, two passages by different writers, both of singular value in this connection, may be recommended. One is the Dissertation in the first volume of Neale and Littledale's Commentary on the Psalms on *The Interpretation of the Psalms.* The other is the chapter on *The Holy Scriptures* in Volume II. of Mortimer's *Catholic Faith and Practice.*

It is only necessary to add here that the priest who wishes to be equipped with the knowledge appropriate to his calling, and so essential to his ministry, will be constantly engaged in the methodical study of Holy Scripture, and that in this study, as in that of dogmatic theology, he will avoid reliance on modern authors who have little respect for the historic and traditional exegesis. One commentary he will find quite invaluable, that of Cornelius à Lapide, where he will read the teachings of the Fathers and Doctors clearly and copiously set forth. The Commentary is not quite complete, since it does not contain the Psalms or the Book of Job. But Neale and Littledale on the Psalms leaves little to be desired, while both omissions in Cornelius à Lapide are supplied in later editions by other writers on the same lines. Only those who are thoroughly conversant with the ancient and sound tradition of Biblical interpretation can safely study the biblical literature of a certain type, so common to-day, with its critical examination of the sacred text and its rationalist treatment of the inspired authors.

(iii.) *Ascetic and Moral Theology.* The knowledge which a priest requires begins with the study of the Christian Faith. For the Christian life is based on the creed, and a right faith, informed by an adequate knowledge, is of primary importance. But, inasmuch as Christianity is not merely a system of belief, but a life, it will be necessary to study the practical science of Christian conduct, the application to daily prayer and work of Christian principles as tested by spiritual experience. This brings us to the realm of ascetic theology. Here again the English Church has suffered from her isolation from the rest of historic Christendom and her loss of touch with Church tradition. The result is most unfortunate. The clergy cannot afford to be mere experimenters in the regulation of their own spiritual life; still less in the guidance of others who look to them for counsel. They are professional men, and must not be content to be amateurs in so important a matter as the regulation of conduct. They are called to be especially men of prayer, and they cannot afford to disregard the accumulated knowledge of Christian experience in its bearing on the science of prayer. Moral theology, important as it is, is far less important than ascetic theology. And it is necessary to insist on this, because of recent years there has been a marked tendency to revive the study of moral theology, apart from a corresponding revival of the study of ascetics. Moral theology deals with human actions with regard to their sinfulness. It answers the question, "What is lawful?" and estimates the degree of sin in various acts. In some degree this knowledge is necessary, since the priest has to deal with sinners and to act as a judge. But the whole tendency of moral theology, confining itself to the question, "What is actually sinful?" is to minimize obligations, not to press more hardly upon sinful men than is required of a judge who must be both just and merciful. Apart from the knowledge of ascetic theology, this tendency carries with it grave dangers to spirituality. The priest must apply to his own conduct a higher standard than that which regards conduct solely with a view to its degree of sinfulness. And with regard to the guidance of others, it has to be remembered that the priest is not only a judge who must be merciful, but a counsellor who must lead souls, as far as he may, to Christian perfection. Bishop Ullathorne once said to a priest: "Never, either for yourself or your people, let your moral theology be your guide in direction." And the same priest, commenting on this advice, said: "To regulate one's relations with God by moral theology is as if one regulated one's relations with one's friends by the aid of a lawyer." Only study and experience combined can give a priest that knowledge of the principles of the interior life which is essential for the conduct of his own life and the guidance of others. And the study which is required can be gained only by reading really scientific works on ascetics, with some knowledge of scientific morality. A reliable standard work on ascetics is Scaramelli's *Directorium Asceticum*, in four volumes. But it will need to be supplemented by later works, and particularly by some good treatise on prayer.[1] Similarly, Gury's *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, in two volumes, is a good work of reference, requiring to be supplemented by one of the many modern handbooks on the subject.

(iv.) *Liturgiology, ceremonial and homiletics.* Ascetic theology will supply the priest with the guiding principle of his interior life. But his life is not only interior but exterior, consisting not only of a right intention and motives informing and vitalizing his actions, but of the right exterior performance of his functions. It seems indeed strange that those who are being prepared for the sacred ministry should receive so little practical training in the manner of performing their duties. After all, there is a right way and a wrong way of performing almost any action. In any craft, the expert craftsman is distinguished from the amateur by the knowledge, based on the experience of his fellow craftsmen, of how his particular work should be done. In the Church, ceremonial has been the subject of a long experience from which definite rules have emerged. And no priest who wishes to be a good craftsman in the most august of crafts, namely priestcraft, can afford to neglect these rules. Accordingly he will study the structure of the Liturgy and other sacred rites, with the rubrical directions, and endeavour to celebrate the sacred mysteries and other services in accordance with them. Here again he will remember that we in England have lost touch with the ceremonial tradition of the Church, a fact to which the slovenly and eccentric ministrations prevalent among us bear melancholy testimony, and will not hesitate to seek for guidance from the admirably full and clear rubrics which dictate ceremonial in the rest of the Western Church.

And here a word of caution may well be added.

---

[1] Poulain's *Des grâces d'oraison* (also translated into English) may be recommended. Also, Lehodey's *Ways of Mental Prayer*, a shorter work and most valuable.

A somewhat morbid fear of resembling our Roman brethren even in the things they do best has led to the adoption of the ceremonial prevalent, so far as it can be ascertained (and the qualification is an important one), in the era before the Reformation, when we were still in touch with the main body of the Western Church and its living traditions. The claim that in this way obedience is secured to an "English use" is a doubtful one at best. For it is probable that the English use of the sixteenth century differed little, if at all, from uses outside England. And certainly many features of this earlier use have been deliberately abandoned by western ceremonial tradition, which has not been content to stand still in the science of a fitting exterior performance of ceremonies. Our experience in England is not such as to justify us in assuming that methods which the rest of the Church has abandoned are the best methods. After all, in this as in so much else, we want to be efficient rather than English.

Something must be said about homiletics, if only for the reason that there is so much to be avoided in the way of modern sermons. For one thing, there still seems to be a considerable demand for sermons to help out the clergy who have to preach often and are diffident as to their own powers of composition. It would seem too, to judge from the specimens which abound, as if they would take almost anything that is offered them. And it is much to be desired that their standards of judgment should be reformed by a study of really good sermons. As a general rule, it is best to avoid all modern sermons. The great majority of them leave much to be desired both as regard the treatment of religious subjects, and the dignity of style which befits the Christian pulpit. Preaching is too large a subject to be entered on here. It must suffice to say that it should combine simplicity and dignity, avoiding alike obscurity, vulgarity and pomposity. And the best models of style are undoubtedly the great French preachers such as Bossuet and Bourdaloue, whose works are easily obtained. It is well to have a good technical manual, such as Schouppé's *Adjumenta Oratoris Sacri.* And for those who read French, *Le Prêtre*, by the Abbé Berthier, is an astonishing collection of valuable material, with many admirable hints as to method of treatment, outweighing in value libraries of modern sermons.

From the knowledge acquired, mainly though by no means entirely, by the exercise of the intellect, we pass to consider that knowledge infused into the soul by the action of grace, although requiring the co-operation of the human intellect. The distinction between what we have called acquired knowledge and infused knowledge may be made in another way, by distinguishing between the various methods in which God speaks to the soul. He speaks through the written word, both in Holy Scripture and, in a less degree, through spiritual writings: he speaks through the spoken word of those who teach his truth in his name. But he speaks also through the silent word of which St. Thomas à Kempis writes in a familiar passage of singular beauty, the *interna Christi locutio ad animam fidelem*, whereby without words he instructs and illuminates the heart.

This action of the silent word upon the soul, both enabling its faculties and feeding them with material, sharpening the inward hearing, clarifying the spiritual vision, and revealing truth to them, is of course a process of grace. The penitential energies which we have considered in an earlier chapter by purifying the soul increase its vision. The use of the sacraments generally, with the access of sanctifying grace which they bring, makes for growth in this intuitive knowledge. But it depends especially upon the habit of meditation, with two essential preliminaries which constitute the remote preparation for this habit. And therefore it is important to consider briefly the place of meditation in the priest's life, and the relation to it of these preliminaries.

The preliminaries are silence, and spiritual reading: and it is necessary to say a word about each.

(i.) *Silence.* It has already been said that dissipation and distraction constitute a very real danger to the priestly life. The life which is complicated by a number of exterior activities, in which the single aim of divine service is easily forgotten, is attended by the risk of losing both simplicity and power. Exterior activities there must be: but they need, like the actions of the Liturgy, to be knit into the service of God and vitalized by a pure intention. The Liturgy shows us how spoken words may be related to an august service and invested with significance. But even in the Liturgy, as in the passion of our Lord which the Liturgy commemorates, the silences heighten the significance of words; while garrulity, a fault into which the priest may too easily fall, robs speech of its value. And garrulity is not in itself the greatest danger. It is the unquiet soul, constantly and easily distracted, seldom or never tranquil and recollected, of which overmuch talking is commonly an outward sign, that robs the life of simplicity, significance, and power. It follows that what the priest has to cultivate is an interior silence, a stillness and tranquillity of soul, in which the voice of God may speak and be heard. And this inward tranquillity depends largely upon an outward silence in which the tongue is quiet and the lips bridled. Such silence, especially secured for the purpose of quiet communion with God, is most necessary to the priest. Hence the habit of the yearly retreat for the inside of a week on which all spiritual writers insist. It is enough to say here that this yearly retreat is of real importance and that the three days commonly allotted to it among us are all too few. It is to be wished that five days, or at the least four, might be regarded as the minimum length for a priest's retreat. With an increased realization of all that is at stake in the spirituality of priests, and especially of secular priests, whose lives are so often dangerously full of exterior activities of every kind, we might hope for retreats of eight days; and such retreats would probably do more for the English priesthood than anything else could.

Besides the annual retreat there is the monthly day of recollection, when the priest tries to get a day of silence, with a view to giving some hours to meditation and spiritual exercises and to renewing the fruits of his last retreat. It is a great help to many when such days are organized for groups of clergymen: but they should be easily possible for individual priests who realize the value of such periods of recollection.

The occasional Quiet Day, which too commonly does duty among us for both the annual retreat and the monthly day of recollection, and which is sometimes a social gathering punctuated by sermons, rather than a series of spiritual exercises in a setting of silence, is at best of little value, and at its worst actually dissipates rather than intensifies tranquillity, while its existence tends to defeat the chance of getting something more effectual.

Of the daily retreat we have already spoken as the parallel in the life of the priest to the sacristy in the formal ministry of the sanctuary, the enclosed space in which he gathers up the spiritual energies which give his ministry vitality and power. This daily retreat is the lengthened period between the exterior activities of one day and the next which is divided between physical rest and spiritual exercises; and silence belongs naturally to it, but needs none the less to be guarded, and to be made interior as well as exterior, by a habit, consciously cultivated, of putting away all disturbing or distracting thoughts and imaginations.

But even the daily retreat, like the annual and monthly periods of recollection, is only preparatory. The priest's daily life needs, like his formal ministry, to be marked by silences, silences which themselves speak. Besides the daily morning exercises, the meditation, the mass with its half-hour of preparation and thanksgiving, all of which belong to the daily retreat, there will be the midday period of silence for special examen, the afternoon visit to the Blessed Sacrament, if it may be, or at least to the Church for a few quiet moments, all making for the continual cultivation of an inner stillness (ii.) *Spiritual reading.* Silence, valuable as it is, is in itself a merely negative preparation for the interior illumination which is sought. It clears away certain exterior distractions and, going deeper, seeks to empty the soul of all disturbance. All this is most necessary. But it is not all that is needed. We need to be on our guard against the proved dangers of Quietism. And there are some signs of a modern tendency in some quarters to a cult of silence which is without proportion, and like all disproportionate cults threatens to obscure the true function of that which it inculcates. An exterior silence sought for its own sake, treated as an end rather than a means, is capable of seriously endangering the balance and sanity of the spiritual life. And the same thing is true of interior silence sought for its own sake. It is not enough to empty the soul of what disturbs it: it is necessary to furnish it with holy thoughts of God, lest silence become the occasion for a morbid introspection or a preoccupation with self, all the more dangerous for masquerading under a spiritual guise. In saying this, we do not forget that there is, in the advanced stages of the spiritual life, a state of quiet to which God calls the soul, in which it is wrapped in an utter interior silence, even the conscious processes of thought being suspended. But this silence belongs only to an advanced stage, to an extraordinary degree of spirituality, while we have to consider normal conditions and persons of ordinary spiritual gifts. Moreover, this state of quiet is never attained, and may not be sought, by human endeavour. It comes by the sole action of God, and at best can only be prepared for by a careful attention to the normal laws which govern spiritual progress. And these normal laws inculcate careful attention to spiritual reading as a necessary and positive part of the remote preparation for meditation.

Spiritual reading is one of the principal means of cultivating in the soul that gift of wisdom which is essentially a right view of life. We live in a world full of the foolishness which forgets the things that really matter and interests itself in trifles. If silence is necessary as turning away the attention of the soul from the transitory and trifling, spiritual reading completes its work by fixing the attention on the eternal and essential. It is a link between study and prayer, reacting on the one and redeeming it from the dangers of a mere intellectualism, and preparing for the other, feeding it with material and redeeming it from the barrenness and distraction which so easily beset it. It is a safe rule to lay down that, besides the spiritual reading of Holy Scripture which is necessarily involved in the recitation of the offices, and in the study of the Bible, if this study is not to be merely intellectual, the priest should have a good spiritual book at hand and read it daily. It is not necessary here to attempt a catena of good spiritual books. Anything like a complete catalogue of even the spiritual classics, such as the *Imitation*, Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*, and the works of St. Francis of Sales, would be a lengthy matter: and every priest is sure to know of many such books. It may perhaps be worth while to mention two which are not so widely read as they deserve. The one is Arvisenet's *Memoriale Vitae Sacerdotis*, a book which no priest should be without. The other is Arnold's *Imitation of the Sacred Heart*, far less known than many books of less value for the cultivation of a solid piety. What is more important is to insist, here again, on the importance of reading the best spiritual books and avoiding the multitude of modern manuals which are more sentimental than scientific.

(iii.) *Meditation*. It is impossible to insist too strongly upon the importance for the priest of daily mental prayer, or, as it is sometimes called, the daily meditation. It is the daily meditation which above all else fosters the growth of the soul in the infused knowledge of God. It is possible for all, though easy for none. To give it up because it is difficult is to renounce the benefits which God bestows through it and which the priest needs above all others. Difficulties come commonly, not from an inability for meditation, too often assumed as an excuse for abandoning it, but from insufficient care over the preparation for it, or from a failure to grasp its possibilities. For it is certain that souls differ very widely and that the method of meditation which is profitable for one is ill adapted to another. What is certain is that all can meditate in one way or another, and it is obviously important for each person to find the method best suited to himself. Every priest should take it as axiomatic that meditation in one method or another is not only possible but necessary for him, and should accordingly regulate his life to secure his daily half-hour at least of mental prayer. The excuse of being too busy is one not to be admitted for a moment. The priest is bound to make time for what is of most importance, and it is of the utmost moment that he should engage in an occupation so necessary to his own spiritual progress and the work which depends upon his spiritual energies for its effectiveness. We must add that the meditation should be made in the morning, while the energies of body and soul are at their keenest. And the earlier the better. The ideal time is before mass. So Arvisenet writes in his *Memoriale Vitae Sacerdotis:*

"O Sacerdos! ligna mane subjice per singulos dies, ut ignis in altari meo enutriatur et semper ardeat.

"Oratio mane facta tenebras pellit, et animam divino lumini aperit; primitias cogitationum et actionum diei consecra mihi supremo Domino, cui primum et ante omnia, et super omnia, omnis creatura servire debet."

Another point of real importance is that the meditation should be prepared overnight with some care. It seems best to connect this with the spiritual reading which, as we have seen, forms a preparation for mental prayer. Quarter of an hour or twenty minutes' spiritual reading in the evening, followed by ten minutes given to the choice of the subject for the next morning's meditation, and the noting down briefly of the lines on which it is to be made, may easily become a habit and will do much to secure efficacy in the morning exercise. It is a common practice of great value to recall the subject to the mind on going to bed and to keep it in view while getting up in the morning.

It is not proposed to deal here at length with the details of meditation or with the characteristic features and the advantages of particular methods.[1] But something must be said of the main processes common to all methods, their relation to one another, and the objects aimed at.

All meditation consists of the exercise, after preliminary prayers which ask for grace, of the three great faculties of the soul, the mind, the will, and the affections, with God, directly or indirectly, as their object. Hence we get the threefold division :—

1. Meditation proper, or the exercise of the *mind* by reflection on divine truth. This will involve the use of the various powers of the intellect. The memory is engaged in recollecting aspects of the truth or the particulars of revelation ; the imagination is exercised in setting vividly before the soul the presence of God, the person of Christ, or the events of Scripture mysteries ; the reason deduces from the promises set before it doctrinal consequences and motives for devotion and conduct. This deductive process forms, in the more ordinary forms of meditation, the link between this and the next stage. But before passing on to a further stage, it must be insisted that this reflection on divine truths is only subsidiary to the main objects of meditation, which are prayer, the converse of the soul with God, and conduct. It is necessary to say this, because the name of meditation, applied to the whole exercise, does sometimes lead to the error of supposing pious reflections to constitute the main purpose, if not the whole object in view. It must be made quite clear that only a comparatively small part of the time available should be used in this way, seven or eight minutes for instance

---

[1] For some account of various methods, see Appendix I.

in a meditation of half an hour. And for this reason the name mental prayer is better than that of meditation, as emphasizing the main object of the exercise. We may go still further. In many cases the preliminary considerations may be reduced to the briefest possible dimensions, or even dispensed with. The truth is that they are a machinery which has as its object the setting the soul in relation with the object meditated on. With many, especially beginners, not as yet familiarized with religious ideas, they are a very necessary machinery: they can hardly get into the environment of their subject without them. With others, and commonly at a later stage, it is an easy matter, with very little intellectual process, or with practically none, to arrive at the same point. And it is a great mistake for such persons to employ time and energy which is better reserved for the later stages. Many, after a few preliminary prayers for the graces of the Holy Ghost, seat themselves naturally in spirit at the feet of Christ, regarding him in some one aspect, as the Good Shepherd, the King, or the beloved Bridegroom of the soul, and begin to hold loving discourse with him.

2. Resolution, or the exercise of the *will* in the formation of holy resolutions. This should always form some part of the meditation, although it will not always come in this place. The ordinary forms of meditation, such as the Ignatian, provide for this in sequence with the practical use of the intellect. The question, "What lesson does this teach me?" is naturally followed by the resolution, "I will therefore do this particular thing." The three chief points about the resolutions made in meditation are these: First, they should be wisely made after prayer for guidance, and with a due regard to what is possible. Easy resolutions, the performance of which lies well within the powers of the individual, are best. Secondly, they should be strongly made by a real effort of the will. Thirdly, they should be faithfully performed. Very much depends on a careful observance of these points. For it is here, in

the domain of the will and its exercise, that mental prayer affects and governs the course of the life.

3. Affective prayer, or mental prayer proper, exercising the *affections*. Here the soul falls to loving converse with God, with our Lord, making acts of adoration, thanksgiving, wonder, humiliation, penitence, reparation, submission, love and so on. To this stage belong the colloquies of the soul with itself, with our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the saints and the angels, which also give play to the affections and increase the spirit of piety. This affective element is often the weakest part of meditations. It is certainly the most important. And growth in it is the surest index to advance in spirituality. For this reason those who are advanced in the practice of mental prayer will often find it best to follow a simple method on the Sulpician lines which after brief preliminaries falls to acts of adoration, contrition, thanksgiving, supplication, with a resolution at some point, and makes of such acts, followed by a few colloquies with our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the saints and angels, the whole body of the meditation.

It is a good practice to choose at the close of the exercise some one thought to be constantly recurred to during the day: the "spiritual bouquet," as it is sometimes called, the fragrance of which the soul will constantly seek to inhale.

In meditation the soul draws near to God and is illuminated. This inward illumination is a primary necessity to the priest, called upon to be "a burning and a shining light" in the darkness of a world that knows not God. Without a diligent attention to mental prayer, his life, if not a positive walking in the darkness, will be lived in a half light: he will go stumblingly and uncertainly where he needs to walk surely, that he may lead others. He is meant to be a link between earth and heaven: and the daily meditation is a necessary point of daily contact with heaven. As a priest of the sanctuary he must give himself to constant converse with the invisible presences that people the sanctuary.

This life of study and prayer is fruitful in special graces which the priest needs. It gives him knowledge of God; it gives him also power with God. It enables him to deal with souls, whether in private or public, with the sure touch of the expert: and this begets confidence and gives him power with men to lead them to God. He inherits the promise of Holy Scripture, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee."[1] Recollectedness and inward tranquillity grow in the soul and counteract the tendency of multiplied activities to produce fussiness and distraction: outward activities acquire a new power and significance, like the actions of the Liturgy, from the atmosphere of other-worldliness which the priest brings from his studies and meditations. Spiritual joy, so needed in a life of constant trials and disappointments, wells up in the soul. Where he would be tempted to lose heart and abandon effort, but for his contact with God illuminating and inspiring the inner man, he is enabled to go on with serenity. He holds the clue to the perplexing puzzles of life, for he lives in the light of the sanctuary where alone, in the presence of God, his purposes are discerned. In the trials of life the Christian comes to the sanctuary to gain understanding. The priest dwells there, that he may never lose it.

---

[1] Isa. xxvi. 3.

CHAPTER IX

THE SACRIFICE OF THANKSGIVING

φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν

THE third variety of sacrifice under the Old Covenant was the peace-offering, or sacrifice of thanksgiving. Alone of the Jewish sacrifices it embraced all the six ritual actions already enumerated, the presentation of the victim, the imposition of hands, the slaying, the pouring out of the blood, the burning on the altar, and the sacrificial meal in which both priest and people shared. It thus partook of the nature of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering. But while they emphasized respectively the manipulation of the blood and the consumption of the sacrifice by the holy fire from God, it reserved its emphasis for the final action, the feast on the sacrifice. By this emphasis it enlarged the content of holiness, already made more positive in the burnt-offering than in the sin-offering which viewed it from the negative side in relation to sin: it also filled out the idea of priesthood. For while the sin-offering, with its emphasis on the atoning blood, spoke of reconciliation with a God offended by sin; and the burnt-offering, by the stress on the accepted offering, accepted by fire, shewed man consecrated to the worship of a supreme God and dignified by the relation to him; the peace-offering, setting man down, as it were, at God's table, to feast with him, proclaimed his intimacy with a God of love. And priesthood comes to be not only something that atones and enlightens, but something that mediates in the energies of love. Love of God and man becomes the highest expression of priesthood.

After the first three ritual actions, which were proceeded with exactly as in the burnt-offering, the body of the victim was divided into three parts. The first portion consisted of the fat and certain of the inward parts, which were burnt upon the altar, being laid upon the burnt-offering. This was God's portion, "the food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord."[1] The second comprised the breast and shoulder, the "wave-breast" and the "heave-shoulder" as they were called, which formed the priests' portion, the breast being assigned to the priests generally,[2] the shoulder to the officiating priest.[3] The third part, or remainder of the victim, was eaten by the offerer and his household.

A word must be said about the "waving" and "heaving" which formed a ceremony peculiar to the peace-offering. They formed a ritual of offering to God. The whole victim was regarded as offered to God and sanctified by the burning of the fat and inward parts. So that priest and people ate of what was already consecrated to God. But the priest's portion was especially consecrated by these further ceremonies of heaving and waving. The "heaving" was, as the name implies, an elevation, and expressed the offering of that which was elevated to God, the lifting it up into the heavenly sphere. The waving consisted of a movement of the offering backwards and forwards, to right and to left, and was apparently joined with an elevation. Thus Rabbi Bechai says: "He moves it forwards and backwards to him whose are the four quarters of the world; and upwards and downwards, to him who is the Lord of heaven and earth."[4] The waving, no less than the heaving, denotes presentation to the God who is omnipresent.

And it is of interest to note that both ceremonies can be traced in the ceremonial of the Christian sacrifice from the earliest date at which any full knowledge of its details is available. From ancient times to the present day the eucharistic oblations have been elevated to God,[1] the sacred host has been moved backwards and forwards, to right and to left, making the sign of the cross. The same meaning has been attached by the words of the Eastern liturgies, " The holy things are lifted up to the holy places," accompanying the action, and there can be little doubt that the same significance attaches to the movement of the host towards the four quarters.

---

[1] Lev. iii. 11.

[2] Exod. xxix. 27, 28; Lev. vii. 31, 34.

[3] Lev. vii. 32.

[4] Outram on *Sacrifice*, i, xv, 5.

It is important, too, to notice the emphasis given by the " priests' portion," thus especially consecrated to God in the peace-offering, to the special relation of the priest to God. This finds expression, as we have seen, in the other kinds of sacrifices. In the sin-offering the priest had for his portion the bulk of the flesh of the victim, except where it was offered for the high priest or the whole congregation, and was held, in virtue of this portion, to " bear the iniquity of the congregation."[2] In the burnt-offering the skin fell to his share,[3] together with the " minchah," the meat-offering of bread,[4] in offerings for the laity, left over after part had been burnt on the altar. The shew-bread also, probably to be connected with this " minchah," was eaten by the priests.[5] In the peace-offering the priest is revealed as privileged with a special intimacy with God. All alike feast with God. But to the priest is given a special portion in the feast, as Joseph, feasting his brethren, gave a five-fold portion to Benjamin,[6] or as Samuel gave to Saul the special portion, the shoulder, to mark him out as God's chosen.[7]

One more point must be noted in order to complete the account of the ceremonial of the peace-offering. With the ordinary peace-offerings, as distinguished from the votive and free-will offerings, besides the unleavened cakes, offered as in the burnt-offering, loaves of leavened bread were offered. These were never burnt on the altar, since no leaven might be burnt in sacrifice to God. But in part they were elevated with the heave-offering and went to form the portion of the officiating priest, while the remainder, "the bread of the eucharist,"[1] as it was called, was consumed by the worshippers. This feature, as Freeman notes, was "a wonderful provision for the growth of the Eucharist out of this rite."[2]

---

[1] Note.—The elevation of the host immediately after the consecration is not an ancient ceremony, but of mediaeval origin. Unlike the slighter elevation made later in the service, its object is to show the Sacrament to the people, for their worship, rather than to elevate it to God for his acceptance.

[2] Lev. x. 17.

[3] Lev. vii. 8.

[4] Lev. vi. 16.

[5] Lev. xxiv. 7-9.

[6] Gen. xliii. 34.

[7] 1 Sam. ix. 23, 24.

The most famous and important of the peace-offerings was, of course, the Passover sacrifice, with all its wealth of significant ceremonial pointing to the offering of "Christ our Passover."[3] And thus, most appropriately, our Lord chose to place the institution of the Christian sacrifice in its immediate juxtaposition, and to substitute his own body and blood, under the signs of bread and wine, for the legal victim. But what the Passover symbolized with an added significance was prefigured by every peace-offering. So a writer on the Jewish sacrifices has said:

"Thus did they thrice in the year at least, at their great feasts, and at other times of their own voluntary will, make solemn and thankful remembrance before God of the one original Passover sacrifice of a lamb, by which they had been redeemed unto God, and plead in the most prevailing manner the virtue and the powers of it; unite themselves afresh to the great continual offering; lay themselves, in a mysterious but wonderfully real manner, upon the altar for dedication and acceptance, and receive from the altar, through the medium of the one priest and sacrifice, all the blessings of the covenant. It is impossible that anything should more accurately copy and foreshow the means by which, under the Christian dispensation, men were to make remembrance of, and plead in the most prevailing way, the once-offered but continually-presented sacrifice of Christ, unite themselves afresh to it, lay themselves in a mystery on the heavenly altar for dedication and acceptance, and receive from that altar through the one Priest and the one Sacrifice, all the gifts and blessings of the new and perfect covenant."[1]

---

[1] Lev. vii. 13, and cp. Amos iv. 5.

[2] *Principles of Divine Service*, ii, 2, p. 272.

[3] 1 Cor. v. 7.

The Christian Eucharist, while summing up in itself all the legal sacrifices, resembles the Jewish peace-offering or Eucharist more nearly than any other. As the peace-offering in general and the Passover in particular commemorated the deliverance from Egypt which prepared for the Sinaitic covenant, and recalling the original Passover thanked God continually for it and for all the benefits which flowed from it; so the Christian sacrifice of thanksgiving recalls the benefit of redemption effected by the death of the Lamb of God on Calvary and thanks God incessantly both for that redemption and for all the blessings arising out of the new covenant based on it. Our Lord, in instituting it, began with thanksgiving. And all the known liturgies give prominence to the Eucharistic Thanksgiving, which, very full in the older rites and recalling the Hallel which accompanied the Passover, survives in a more meagre form in the Preface of the Western Liturgy: "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord holy, Father Almighty, Everlasting God. Therefore with Angels and Archangels and with all the company of heaven, etc."

Again, like the Passover and the peace-offering generally, the Christian Liturgy is a feast to which the faithful are admitted, to eat and drink with God[2] in token of the intimacy with him to which his Love admits them. Thus, as the exhortation in the English Prayer Book implies, it is the supreme expression of God's love to man. "It is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament." The Eucharist is in fact the central summary and expression of that divine charity which binds man both to God and to his fellow man in the energies of love. Hence the constant insistence on the necessity of approaching the altar in a state of charity with God and man. To put the same truth in another form, the Holy Communion is the concrete expression of the "communion of saints," linking man, not only to God, but to the whole body of the faithful, to the "company of heaven" and the faithful departed no less than to the Church militant on earth. Round the altars of Christendom the whole Church, the family of God, is revealed as

---

[1] Jukes, *The Law of the Offerings*, p. 99.

[2] cp. Exod. xxiv. 11.

> every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

Once more, like the peace-offering, the Liturgy emphasizes the special intimacy of the priest with God. In the Christian Sacrifice, as in the Jewish, he has his special portion. The offertory, in its original form, consisted of the oblation at the Liturgy by the people of gifts both in money and kind. From these the bread and wine for consecration were taken. But from the same oblation the clergy were provided for, witnessing to the continuance of the law, emphasized in the Jewish offerings, that the priests should live of the altar.[3] And many of the offertory sentences in the English Prayer Book witness to this principle, that in the oblations made to God the priest is to find provision made for himself. He is to be, in a peculiar sense, God's pensioner. Nor is this all. From the earliest times the priest has always had a special portion, emphasized in the ceremonial of the liturgy, in the host consecrated at the altar. The earliest form of host would seem to have been a large loaf or cake, of which a specified portion, larger than those distributed to the people, was kept for the priest's communion. In the Liturgy of the Copts, for instance, the celebrant consecrates a white, round, leavened loaf, flat underneath, convex on top, and as large as the palm of the hand. It is stamped with twelve little squares each containing a cross in honour of the twelve Apostles. In the centre is a larger square marked with a larger cross and divided into four smaller squares, and regarded as the symbol of Christ. And it is this central portion which forms the priest's host, the faithful being communicated with fragments broken from the smaller squares on the outside of the loaf. A similar usage is to be found in the Eastern liturgies and probably was the original custom in the West; the large round host for the priest, with the smaller rounds for the people, being a later development. Thus the priest's host, like the priest's portion in the peace-offering, witnesses to the special intimacy of the priest with God. At the feast of divine love he is favoured with a special portion. And his communion is marked by a special emphasis. Not only does he receive before the rest, but his communion is invested with a representative character and invested with a special necessity. Others who are present may or may not receive at the particular Eucharist which is celebrated. He alone must receive: without his communion the eucharistic action lacks integrity. As *forma gregis* he communicates on behalf of the people as well as for himself: he is the representative of the congregation in this supreme expression of their love for God and Christ.

He personifies also the love of Christ for the people. In his name and person he divides to the poor and hungry the bread of life. He is the shepherd feeding the sheep and lambs of the flock, and thus embodying the love of the Good Shepherd for them.

And not only at the communion but throughout the whole action he exemplifies, gathers up, as it were, in himself, the charity towards men which characterizes the communion of saints and finds formal expression in the Liturgy. He functions for the whole Church of God. For their sakes he sanctifies himself: for them he gives thanks, and offers and pleads the sacrifice, making intercession for the needs of all. In their name he associates himself and them with angels and saints, the company of heaven, in a loving worship of the God who is Love. An ambassador of divine love, he invites all who will to join with him in an action which is the response of love to love, to feast with him and with God upon Christ.

The priest's life is the remote preparation for the Liturgy which is his principal occupation and the summary and picture of his whole ministry. It follows that the priest must reproduce in his daily life the essential energies of charity which characterize the Eucharistic feast. To these energies as exercised in the life we must devote a separate chapter.

CHAPTER X

THE LIFE OF CHARITY

περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός ἠγάπησεν
ὑμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν
καὶ θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.

WE have seen that the priest, by the very nature of his office, personifies the love of God in Christ for man, and the answering love of man for God, with the charity to all men which flows as a consequence from it. This will lead us to consider certain general characteristics of the good priest, essential features of sacerdotal holiness, as well as the definite energies of charity which should find a prominent place in the daily life of the priest.

The first general characteristic of the priestly life which emerges is what we may call a twofold abandonment. The priest, as God's pensioner, the special object of the divine providence and love, will practise a special dependence on that love. To him above all others is spiritual poverty, the subject of one of the beatitudes, appropriate. He will also abandon himself to the interests of the people. For he personifies that love of God of which the supreme characteristic is that it led him to give his own Son, that love of Christ which led him and leads him to abandon himself to us. Self-abandonment is the supreme test of love and is therefore the very touchstone of the priestly character. The priest exists, not to get, but to give : to give himself for God to man, and for man to God. All his offerings are stultified in a sense if he fails to give himself, as Christ gave himself, to God and man.

It is this that makes covetousness a fault of peculiar malignity in a priest, and simony the blackest of clerical crimes. Judas, who sought his own profit and betrayed his Master, is the prototype of the bad priest. It is this again which makes the actual poverty in which great numbers of priests in all ages have lived as divinely appropriate as the poverty of Mary at Bethlehem. For them "the Lord is their portion"[1] as he was hers, and those of them who have been true to their priesthood have found it enough that he should be. Where earthly possessions beyond their needs have come their way, they have rejoiced to lavish them on the worship of God and the needs of man. They asked only to spend and be spent in the service of Christ. Liberality is as characteristic of true priesthood as covetousness is contradictory of it.

A second general characteristic to be looked for in the priest is devotion. This is, of course, an important element in all Christianity, since the very essence of the Christian life is a loving service of God and man, and religion is shown not so much by the things we do as by the loving spirit in which the smallest actions are performed. But this devotion, or piety, is to be sought in the priest in a marked and representative degree, corresponding with his position as especially a representative of Christianity.

These two characteristics of priestly life, the self-abandonment which depends upon God and yields itself up to serve without thought of gain, the devotion which makes all ministrations the outward expression of a tender and loving piety, are nourished by definite spiritual energies which become on this account of vital importance in the life of the priest. These energies we will consider in their order.

(i.) *Thanksgiving.* It is noteworthy that the Liturgy takes its name of Eucharist from the energies of thanksgiving which characterize it. Since the supreme expression of charity is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, it is inevitable to conclude that the practice of thanksgiving is peculiarly bound up with the life of charity and that it is especially incumbent upon the priest. And indeed experience shows that the love of God, the spirit of dependence on him, the whole-hearted desire to serve him, is wonderfully fostered by thanksgiving. We may conclude that it should find a prominent place in the prayers and meditations of the priest. He will be constantly thanking God for all the blessings given by him, whether to himself personally, or to the Church, or to individuals. He will be constantly on the look-out for manifestations of God's love to man, will count them up, rejoice in them and render heartfelt thanks for them. As in the Liturgy, he will offer thanksgiving for himself and others. This practice will counteract the tendencies of the inevitable disappointments which will be his, both in his own life and in his ministry to men, to produce discouragement and the slackening of effort. Disappointed in himself, disappointed in the fruits of his ministry, he will find the loving mercies of God a perennial fountain of consolation and joy.

---

[1] Lam. iii. 24; Ps. xvi. 5; cp. Joshua xiii. 14, 33.

(ii.) *Affective Prayer.* Of this, and its place in the priest's devotions, we have already spoken in the chapter which dealt with meditation. Affective prayer belongs especially to the *via unitiva*, the life of union with God by charity. Already in the *via illuminativa* the soul is called to engage more fully in it as a preparation for further advance. Not even the contemplative, separated from the world to yield himself fully to God in the energies of the interior life, stands in greater need of this exercise of the affections towards God than does the secular priest. For the whole character and value of his ministration depends on his cultivation of the attitude towards God which affective prayer forms, and which nothing else can adequately form if this be neglected.

(iii.) *Devotions to our Lord.* Of the association of the priest with our Lord and of the devotions which express this association we have already spoken. The priest will cultivate a special devotion to the holy Gospels and to the *Vita vitae nostrae* recorded in them. He will frequently associate himself, in his actions and in his sufferings, with the actions and sufferings of him whose priesthood he shares. But it remains to consider briefly other special devotions which are prompted by the love of our Lord and in their turn deepen that love in the heart of the priest. What are called the devotions are the special ways in which devotion expresses itself. Many of these are concerned directly with the person of Christ, as all are directly or indirectly. And the priest, with his special need of devotion, cannot afford to neglect them. Three of these devotions, devotion to the Sacred Heart, devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, and devotion to the Sacred Passion, are of special importance and call for a brief notice.

(a) *Devotion to the Sacred Heart.* The supreme need of the Christian, and of the priest in particular, is that his heart should be conformed to the Sacred Heart. He is called by Christ to "learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart," and learning, to "find rest" for his soul.[1] Devotion to the Sacred Heart is simply this learning of Christ, the fashioning of the interior life in accordance with his perfect dispositions, the conscious imitation of that love of God and man which underlay all his words and works. Religion is a matter of the heart no less than of the will, and the priest will often betake himself to the Heart which is at once his refuge and his pattern. He will consider the virtues of that Heart and the place occupied in it by God, the Blessed Virgin, the saints, sinners, little children, the poor, and so on. And he will strive to enshrine in his own heart the same interests, as he will try to cultivate the same virtues.

(b) *Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.* Since the Blessed Sacrament is our Lord, and is especially entrusted to the guardianship of the priest, he will cultivate a special reverence for it. Without this special reverence he must fail in the Liturgy: nor will he find it in the Liturgy unless he cultivates it in his life. His preparation before mass and his thanksgiving after it give him a special opportunity. It is of the highest importance that he should not stint time or effort at these points. To rise late and hurry to the altar, apart from its disedifying effect on the faithful, is dangerous to his own devotion. Nor should he be content then with vocal prayers. It is emphatically a time for affective prayer which shall nourish in the soul a special tenderness to him whom he will presently handle under his eucharistic veils. And if this is true of the moments before mass, it is even more true of the time after mass, when the priest, having unvested, goes to kneel apart and spend his quarter of an hour of thanksgiving and loving communion with him whom he has received and who now dwells in him. Spiritual writers are agreed in attributing the very highest value to the quarter of an hour of prayer after communion. Many of the laity make proof of its influence on the spiritual life. The priest, quite apart from the higher standard of devotion to be expected of him, needs it more than they do. For, unlike them, he is constantly engaged after his communion with the actions and vocal prayers of the Liturgy. They have much quiet time for interior prayer during the course of the service: he must find his quiet time before and after it.

---

[1] Matt. xi. 29.

Nor will he be content that his thanksgiving should end his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament for the day. In a considerable and, happily, increasing number of churches, the Blessed Sacrament is reserved for the sick. And where this is the case an elementary instinct of piety will lead the priest to visit our Lord, present in the tabernacle, and spend some moments of devotion before him. Many priests make a practice of doing this before going out to visit in the afternoon, and most appropriately. But at some time or other in the latter part of the day this should be done. In cases where the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved, the priest might well pay a spiritual visit, kneeling down either at home or in the Church and placing himself in spirit before some tabernacle.

(c) *Devotion to the Sacred Passion.* If the priest is called to a special devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in view of his official connection with it, his official guardianship of it, by parity of reasoning he is obliged to a special devotion to the Passion. Not only is he, as a preacher, set to proclaim Christ crucified: the Liturgy which is his principal occupation is the appointed memorial of the death on the cross. We have already seen how his life is to be one of penitential energies whereby he is "crucified with Christ." And these energies will need for their support a tender and ardent love of Christ crucified, continually reinforced by contemplation of the crucifix. The crucifix has been, in all ages, the book of the saints, who have ascribed to it without hesitation their knowledge and their power. From it lessons can be learnt that no printed volume will teach. The priest, so utterly dependent for the power of his ministrations on his interior energies, cannot afford to dispense with frequent recourse to it. His study of the gospels will have furnished him with a detailed knowledge of the exterior events of the Passion. On the basis of this detailed knowledge he will seek to penetrate behind the outward sufferings of the Passion to the mystery of its inward meaning and the depths of its poignancy, thus growing in love of the Cross and Crucified. It may be useful to mention, as a valuable help to meditation on these lines, the first volume of Fr. Faber's *Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects*, where there are rather more than a hundred pages of notes on this particular devotion, outlining various methods of considering it.

(iv.) *Devotion to our Lady, the Saints and the Angels.*[1] Charity to man is a necessary consequence of charity to God, flowing out of it. To love God is inevitably to love those whom he loves, and to measure our love for them according to the proportion of his. Thus charity, uniting man to God, unites him also to his fellow man, and unites him most closely to those who are most closely united to God. The Communion of Saints is involved in union with Christ. Thus, naturally and inevitably, charity issues in devotion, in the first place, to our Lady and the saints and angels who reign with Christ in heaven. And this devotion, as we might expect, finds expression in the Liturgy, and always has done so. It is to find expression in the life of the priest.

---

[1] See Appendix II.

We must set devotion to the Blessed Virgin in the first place. Of all devotion springing out of love for God we must note that it reinforces in its turn the love from which it flows. The service for love of God of our fellow sinners on earth increases our love for Christ. For we minister to him in them, and love grows by its expression. If there were nothing more to be said about paying a loving honour to Mary than that we honoured God in her, since all her graces are his work, it would furnish a sufficient reason for the devotion to her. But there is more to be said. Our Lady is the highest of all created personalities. Her unique relationship to God incarnate invests her with a unique importance. And the graces which God poured upon her, in such abundance that she alone of merely human beings is described as full of grace, enabled her to correspond with her unique dignity. She is, for all time, the pattern of faith in Jesus, and loving service of him. Hence devotion to her, if it be real, issues in a growth in those virtues in which she excelled. Those who desire to grow in love of Jesus will neglect no proved means of such growth. And Christian experience attests to the uttermost the teaching of ascetic theology that devotion to her is a sure means of spiritual growth and especially of growth in charity.

Moreover priests have by their office a special link with the Blessed Virgin. For her office related her to our Lord in a way which, although unique, yet suggests comparisons with the priest's functions. She brought him to earth in human vesture, as the priest brings him to the altar by consecration : she bore him in her arms, as the priest bears the sacred Host, and showed him to men as the priest holds up the Blessed Sacrament to their gaze. Like the priest at mass, she was the principal worshipper at Bethlehem: she offered Jesus to God at Jerusalem, as the priest offers him at the altar. We may add the fact that her Son's honour and interests, so dear to her, are particularly concerned with the sanctity of the priest, as giving him a special claim on her prayers. And those prayers, as Catholic Christendom teaches with one voice, avail beyond all others.

Enough has been said to commend this devotion to priests. It remains to mention two of the most common forms in which it finds expression in the best traditions of the sacerdotal life. First, the priest should make good use of that weapon of prayer tried by the experience of millions of Catholics of varying lands, conditions and temperaments, the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin. If he is wise, he will refuse to be put off by the superiority of those who, not having made full proof of its value themselves, depreciate or scorn it. Daily he will say his decade at least, if not, as countless priests do, his chaplet. He will often meditate on its mysteries, that he may learn to say it better. And he will put down initial difficulties, such as beset many forms of devotion, not to the defects of the exercise, but to his own inadequacy, which he may trust the rosary to remedy in time. Besides saying the rosary, it is a common practice among priests to recite with their evening prayers the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, commonly known as the Litany of Loretto: and the practice is certainly one to be commended.

The priest is officially obliged to the *cultus* of the saints by celebrating the Holy Mysteries in their honour on their feasts: and he will naturally therefore reproduce this *cultus* in his private prayers, as an act of devotion which stimulates piety and brings its own reward. He will have his own individual reasons for singling out certain saints for special honour. But two saints may be mentioned here as having especially claimed the devotion of priests as such, the one in earlier, the other in later times. St. John the Baptist, as the precursor of Christ, preparing the way for him by the preaching of repentance, and pointing men to him when he came, is one. And the other is St. Joseph, the earthly guardian of the natural body of Christ, as the priest is the guardian of his sacramental body and of his body mystical. To these St. John the Evangelist might perhaps be added, by reason of his special love of our Lord, his special link with the Passion and with the Mother of Jesus.

The appropriateness to priests of a special devotion to the holy angels scarcely needs to be proved. The priesthood is, as the Michaelmas collect reminds us, the earthly counterpart of the heavenly hierarchy. The ministry of the angels, who serve God with joyful alacrity and selfless devotion, and serve us for love of him, with their gaze ever fixed upon him, is a pattern which priests need to keep constantly before them. In his service of God the priest will be moved to devotion by the conscious association of his worship with theirs, an association finding expression in the Liturgy. Beset as he so often is by the temptation to a slothful and unloving service, he will honour the angels for their alacrity and devotion, and pray to imitate it, as indeed he does implicitly in the Lord's Prayer. And in the service of man again he will try to copy the same pattern, remembering that our Lord himself referred to the angels as evidencing the value in God's sight of the little child and of the sinner. A valuable form of intercession is that which takes the form of commending others to the care of the angels.

(v.) *Intercession.* The life lived in the energies of charity will be one of devotion, not only to God himself, the person of Christ, and the company of heaven, but also, in varying degrees, to the faithful on earth and to the holy dead. Of this devotion as shown by the exterior activities which it prompts it is impossible to treat fully here: to attempt to do so would be to go beyond the limits of our subject. We must be content to say that the attitude of the priest in life towards various classes will reproduce his attitude in the Liturgy, where he speaks graciously for God to man, and offers man the best gift put at his disposal. It follows from what has been already said that he will cultivate a very special devotion for the Church, as the body of Christ and as claiming from him a whole-hearted service: it follows also that he will manifest a special love and reverence for those who share with him the priesthood of the Christian ministry. His devotion to the Sacred Heart will prompt a special tenderness towards the devout, the little children and sinners. And his charity towards men will find expression in his prayers in constant and comprehensive intercession. He was ordained for this, that at the altar he should make intercession for the living and the dead. And this intercession will be prominent in the life as in the Liturgy.

There are many manuals of intercessory prayer in existence, giving comprehensive schemes which cover the whole ground, and it is not proposed here to give anything like a complete account of subjects or methods. Our main object is to insist on the importance of intercession, too commonly neglected, as one of the principal duties which the priest exists to perform.

But two things may be said, as to the method, and as to the subjects.

First of all, with regard to the method. It will be noticed that the Liturgy suggests two methods. There is the method of definite vocal prayer, such as is found for instance in many of the collects and in the Prayer for the Church Militant. And there is the method of intention, where the priest offers by way of intercession for certain individuals or classes, not using any definite prayers expressive of their individual needs, but performing the whole service with this intention. This method is capable of extension in his other offices and in his private prayer. Before saying a psalm or devotion the priest may direct his intention, thus reciting it by way of intercession for any particular person or persons.

In this way he can accomplish a great deal more in the way of intercession, even in the discharge of his official obligations, than would otherwise be possible.

Secondly, as to the subjects. The priest can never be satisfied with prayer simply for classes of people. It is the characteristic of the Good Shepherd that he has an individual love and care for his sheep and the lambs of his flock. The charity of the priest will go out to individuals and will express itself in prayer for them singly. And this especially in the case of the parochial clergy. Stress is rightly laid on the importance of parochial visitation as helping the priest to come into personal touch with each member of his flock. The results of visiting are often disappointing, and it is worth while to ask whether the failure is not to be ascribed to a lack of insistence on individualized intercession. Surely parochial visitation should be preceded or followed by a spiritual visitation, in which, on his knees at home or in church, the priest goes in spirit from house to house, pleading with God the needs of the individuals committed to his charge. If there were more of this kind of visitation, the other would undoubtedly be less fruitful of disappointment.

(vi.) *Devotion to the Holy Ghost.* As we saw at the outset, self-oblation is of the essence of priesthood. The priest must be himself a sacrifice, an "offering to the Lord." And this self-oblation must be in the energies of charity. As the great High Priest offered himself to God for man and to man for God, in the energies of the love for God and man which consumed him, so must it be with those who share his priesthood. Like Simon the son of Onias, whose priesthood was a type of his and theirs, they must be *quasi ignis effulgens, et thus ardens in igne.*[1] In the old sacrifices it was the fire from God which, enfolding the victim and lifting it up out of a fallen order into the heavenly sphere, marked its acceptance.[2] The Holy Ghost, kindling the heart of the priest with love for God and man, is the antitypal Fire. Unless he transubstantiates the sacrifice, it remains on the altar, a dead and unaccepted offering. The priesthood which is his creation needs his energies at every moment of its exercise. We return then to the devotion to the Holy Ghost, the Author of Charity, as the source of all the energies of devotion which must characterize the life of the priest. The ministry which began to the strains of *Veni Creator Spiritus* must make this its continual invocation.

---

[1] Ecclus. iv. 9.

[2] cp. *Da nobis, clementissime Jesu, ut . . . caritatis igne succensi, ligne in circuitu sacrae buius mensae tuae esse valeamus.* Secret from the Latin Missal (June 4th).

CHAPTER XI

REGULA SACERDOTIS

Πάντα δέ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω.

IT may be laid down as a positive axiom that every priest should have a definite rule of life, ordering his time so that each duty has its own place in it. Not to have such a rule is inevitably to waste the time which, like everything else the priest has, is consecrated to God's service, and to find that certain things have been left out. The priest who lives without a rule takes his sublime occupation less seriously than the business man, working for gain; or the domestic servant, labouring for an earthly master. It is the purpose of this chapter, not indeed to prescribe a rule in any detai —this must be done in each case in view of individual circumstances, which differ widely—but to review briefly the normal occupations common to priests who accept a Catholic standard of life and to suggest roughly the order in which they should come.

Before proceeding further, it will be well to lay down a preliminary principle, a counsel of prudence too often overlooked, and with fatal results. The principle is this, that the normal practice should be stricter than the rule. This is really important. For, human nature being what it is, it is certain that the priest who lives, as it were, on the edge of his rule will often break it. And plainly it is not enough to make a rule: the rule must be kept. To take two simple instances. The person who makes a rule of getting up daily at 6 a.m. and is content always to stop in bed until the hour is likely to break his rule more or less frequently. But if he makes a practice of getting up at half-past five, or even a quarter to six, it needs no exceptional regularity to keep the rule of rising not later than six. Similarly, a rule of going to confession once in three weeks, if made in this form with no attempt at greater frequency, is certain to be broken sooner or later through some unforeseen contingency. But if the practice of fortnightly confession is observed, the rule is far less likely to be infringed. The same principle can be applied to almost everything. The rule should represent, not the ordinary practice, but the minimum to be strictly observed.

Let us then briefly pass in review the occupations which will form at least a substantial part of the material of the priest's rule, beginning from the evening when, the duties of the day performed, or in sight of their end, he looks forward to the following day and prepares for it.

Most priests find it desirable, if not necessary, to anticipate the vocal prayers of the next day, so far as this may be done. Those who recite the breviary say overnight the Matins and Lauds of the following day. The Prayer Book office of Morning Prayer should normally be said in choir before mass.[1] But where it has to be privately recited it does not seem unreasonable to anticipate it overnight. The morning hours are so valuable for mental prayer that it is well to leave them as free as possible for this. Similarly, the office of preparation for mass may be said the evening before. At the same time, the priest will make a mental note of the intention with which he will celebrate, although he will not wait until the day before to fix this, but will make a practice of arranging his intentions at the end of one week for the next. It will be found profitable in many cases also to make a brief preparation for the mental prayer before and after mass. This will not always be needed, and in any case it should not take long. Spiritual reading and the preparation of the next day's meditation, the subject being chosen and the outlines settled, will take from half an hour to three-quarters. These things done, there will remain the evening prayers to be said.[1] While undressing, or in bed, the meditation will be briefly gone through again.

---

[1] These two points may be emphasized. The offices should be said in choir. A prevalent custom of reciting them at a prie-dieu in a side chapel is unseemly. And Morning Prayer should precede mass. To say the only mass of the day and to follow it with the recitation of Morning Prayer is a reversal of the natural order which cannot be defended.

We come now to the beginning of the day. Many priests fix in their rule of life the time for rising, and some also make a definite rule as to the time of going to bed. Others find it better to make the hour of rising depend on the hour at which they have to say Morning Prayer or Mass in church, their rule prescribing the time to be spent before this in their dressing and devotions, and requiring them to rise at a stated interval before the first service. Obviously it is important to have time in the morning for all that should be done, and not to be hurried, since hurry is fatal to recollectedness. What must be laid down as essential is that the priest should decide before going to bed the time of rising, and that he should cultivate the habit of rising with alacrity at that time. This alacrity in rising, so important in the service of God, he may well connect with devotion to the holy angels. While dressing, he will recall the subject and tenor of his meditation. At his morning prayers he will look forward to the duties of the day, resolving to perform them at the proper time and in the right manner, and making the good intention by which he offers to God all his activities, interior or exterior, and all he may be called upon to suffer. An alternative point at which this review of the day's duties may take place is at the close of the thanksgiving after mass. If the breviary be recited, Prime should be fitted in now, and, if the mass be at a late hour, Terce may also be said before it. Many priests postpone the meditation until after mass, or even until after breakfast. But to make it before mass is undoubtedly the ideal arrangement, and is in accordance with the best tradition.[1] It will entail rising a good hour and a half before Morning Prayer or mass.

---

[1] Or these may be said earlier.

For the mass itself, with the quarter of an hour's mental prayer in preparation for it, and the short office of thanksgiving and the mental prayer after it, a good hour must be allowed.

During the morning the priest should find time for study: and this study will be prefaced with prayer. The use of the beautiful prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas[2] for this purpose is traditional, and should surely be more general than it would seem to be. The preparation of sermons will account for part of the time available on some mornings, and may be preceded by the *Veni Creator Spiritus.* This should be frequently used, before anything in the form of sermons, classes, or addresses.

Before the midday meal, office will be recited, and followed by the special examen of conscience. Many priests also devote time at this point to intercession.

Something must certainly be said, in view of the ascetic traditions of the priestly life, about meals. The priest, who at God's Table eats and drinks to his glory, will seek to glorify him, in accordance with the apostolic injunction,[3] in all his eating and drinking. He will be content with simple fare, and at his own table he will, in a manner, feast with Christ, as he does at the altar. It should be quite unnecessary to insist here upon the elementary piety of saying grace before and after food. But a suggestion may well be made in this connection. In religious houses generally, it is the custom to use the singularly beautiful forms which may be found bound up with the Latin breviary, or day hours, both for the blessing of the table and for the returning of thanks after food. These forms are easily procurable. If not used on all occasions, they would surely be more appropriate to clerical gatherings than the shorter forms in common use among lay people.

---

[1] See what has been said on this point on pp. 52, 53.

[2] *Concede mihi, misericors Deus, quae tibi placita sunt ardenter concupiscere, prudenter investigare, veraciter agnoscere et perfecte adimplere ad laudem et gloriam nominis tui. Amen.*

[3] 1 Cor. x. 31.

Another custom in monastic houses is that of prefacing the meal by the reading of a passage from the Gospel, and accompanying it with spiritual reading. So St. Bernard wrote: *Cum comedis, non totus comedas, sed attendas lectioni.* And the third Council of Toledo actually prescribed the reading of holy Scripture at all meals of priests.[1] The custom enforces the truth that man lives not by bread alone, but by the Word of God, and is worth consideration.

Some time in the afternoon the priest will pay his visit to the Blessed Sacrament, where this is possible: and this visit may well include a brief period of detailed intercession and the use of the rosary. Or the rosary may be said before or after Evensong.

Visiting will occupy at least some afternoons, in the case of parochial clergy, and others will be taken up with recreation and social activities. It would be quite impossible to lay down any general rules on these matters, except such as are too obvious to require insisting on. In recreation, as in all else, the priest must "remember the end."[2] Its purpose is to recreate his energies for God's service. He must not forget God in it, or pursue it for its own sake. And he must be "holy in all manner of conversation."[3] This does not mean, of course, that he is to be anything else than simple and natural. Clerical affectations are as odious outside the church as in it. The dignity of the priestly office is not only served by simplicity: it is compromised by anything else.

Consideration of the daily order of the priest's life inevitably brings up the question, for the English priest, of what office is to be said. While it is probable that the saying of Morning and Evening Prayer, involving the monthly recitation of the psalter,[1] satisfies his obligations, it is commonly felt that these are a poor substitute for the canonical hours, and that some offices are needed between the two, offices which it was possibly intended to provide for the clergy when the present services were drawn up, although the provision was never made. Hence the common practice of reciting the lesser hours from the breviary, while substituting Morning and Evening Prayer for the breviary offices of Matins, Lauds, and Vespers. A considerable, and probably increasing, number of priests say the whole breviary. And undoubtedly it is a great gain to do so. The recent reforms have made the recitation far easier, since the office is never over long, and need not take much more than an hour and a quarter to say. Matins and Lauds are said overnight; Prime and Terce, either together or separately, in the early part of the morning; Sext and None somewhere near noon, unless None is left until after the midday meal; and Vespers and Compline in the afternoon or early evening.

---

[1] *In omni sacerdotali convivio lectio divinarum scripturarum misceatur; per hoc enim animae aedificantur ad bonum, et fabulae non necessariae prohibentur.*

[2] Ecclus. vii. 36.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 15.

Besides ordering his day, the priest's rule will provide for periodical duties. Certain things will have to be done on certain days. The different days of the week and the months of the year may be marked by the practice of different devotions.[2] Subjects for intercession may well be tabulated so that they are spread over a week. The rule will specify the intervals at which confession should be made. It will provide for the monthly retreat of a day, if possible, and will definitely enjoin the yearly retreat of some days.

It is well also that the rule should make special provision for exceptions to the daily order. It will be noticed that, in contemplating the normal day of the priest, it has been taken for granted that he will say mass, as so many priests do, daily. Those who are not able to say mass daily, or do not find it advisable to do so, will need to make provision in their rule for occasions when they do not celebrate, and even for days when they will not hear mass. On these latter days it will be well to make a rule of hearing mass spiritually and making a spiritual communion. When mass is heard, the meditation may be made during it, and connected with it. Some priests find it necessary to have a day of rest in each week; and holidays have to be thought of. Nothing is more disastrous than to abandon all regulation of the life at such times. It is reasonable to have a less exacting rule. But a rule there should certainly be; and the days, to whatever reasonable extent given to rest and recreation, should be ordered days. Whether the priest be at work or on a holiday, he remains always a priest, always obliged to that life of self-oblation which orders all its activities *ad majorem Dei gloriam.*

---

[1] The breviary office has developed from the original daily recitation of the psalter. But it failed to provide for a daily recitation, and at the last reform the attempt to do so was frankly abandoned, provision being made, far more satisfactorily, for a weekly recitation. Incidentally this reform justified the English reformers in their abandonment of the principle of the daily recitation.

[2] See Appendix II.

It remains, in conclusion, to consider the priest in time of sickness. At such a time the ordinary rule will have necessarily to be abandoned, either in part or entirely, according to the nature and gravity of the sickness. But it remains of very great importance that the priest should dispose himself to bear whatever inconvenience or suffering is involved for the glory of God. And his rule may well contemplate this contingency and prescribe certain devout practices which do not tax the strength, so far as these are possible. A good principle is to have some substitute, however easy, for what has to be abandoned. Where it is impossible to say office, the rosary may be said instead. A few ejaculations with the eyes upon the crucifix may replace the meditation. Devotion to the crucifix is more than ever needed in pain and sickness. An act of praise to Jesus in the blessed Sacrament, with an act of spiritual communion, may be made at the hour of mass, and again instead of the visit to the Tabernacle.

At the time when, ordinarily, detailed intercession would be made, the sick priest may briefly offer his sufferings to God with the sufferings of our Lord on Calvary for all those objects for which he would desire to pray.

Finally, the time of sickness will be made a special preparation for the priest's death. The priest's life is a dying life, a losing of his life to find it in Christ, a laying of it down for Christ and for the sheep of his flock. Mystically, the priest offers his life to God at every mass. His death will be his last mass. He will be constantly preparing for it in his prayers, that, when his hour comes, he may make this last offering *in spiritu humilitatis et in animo contrito*, that he may yield up his life *digne*, *attente*, *et devote*, and, when it is over, be numbered with those priests who, each in his own generation, have pleased God.

BENEDICITE SACERDOTES DOMINI DOMINO.

APPENDICES

I. Methods of Mental Prayer.

II. Devotions for the Days of the Week and the Months of the Year.

APPENDIX I

METHODS OF MENTAL PRAYER

I. THE IGNATIAN METHOD.

i. *The Preparation.*

- (*a*) *Remote.* Remove obstacles, the spirit of this world, dissipation and distraction, etc. Cultivate the opposite virtues, a spirit of humility, mortification, prayer, etc.
- (*b*) *Immediate.* Read through or prepare the points of the meditation the day before, settling the preludes and scope of the meditation. On rising, let the first thoughts be of the meditation to be made: cherish thoughts suited to it. At the hour fixed for it, enter on the meditation with recollectedness.

ii. *The Beginning.*

- (*a*) *Preparatory Prayer.* Recall the presence of God; adore him; ask for grace to make a good meditation. (Our Father, etc.).
- (*b*) *Preliminaries.*
  1. Set before you the mystery to be contemplated, as if you were present at it; or consider the truth to be meditated upon.
  2. Pray for the grace you desire to gain by your meditation.

iii. *The Body of the Meditation.*

- (*a*) Use *the memory* to recall to mind the subject matter of the meditation (clearly, point by point, briefly, and with devotion).
- (*b*) Exercise *the intellect* on the questions:
  1. What truth is to be considered ?
  2. What practical conclusion am I to draw from it ?
  3. What motives induce to the carrying out of this conclusion ? (*e.g.* how fitting, honourable, useful, easy, pleasant, necessary, is this course of action).
  4. What has been my practice hitherto in this matter ?
  5. What is to be my practice in the future ?
  6. What obstacle must I remove ?
  7. What means must I adopt and carry out ?

(*c*) Exercise *the will.*
  1. Elicit *acts of the affections* throughout the whole meditation, in the heart rather than with the lips, *e.g.* adoration, praise, thanksgiving, oblation, confusion, contrition, love, desire, confidence, etc.
  2. Form particular *resolutions*, practical and adapted to your present needs, founded on solid motives, and humble.

IV. *The Conclusion.*

(*a*) *Colloquies* with the blessed Virgin, your guardian angel, patron saint, saint of the day; with our Lord, as the Beloved, the Physician of your soul, your Shepherd, etc.: with the heavenly Father, as his child, his servant, etc. Vocal prayer.

(*b*) The *glance*, or brief examination of conscience on the meditation.

(*c*) Choose the *maxim*, or "spiritual nosegay" from the meditation, *i.e.* some thought in the words of holy Scripture or the Fathers, to be kept in mind through the day.

(From Schmidt, *Manna Quotidianum Sacerdotum.*)

II. THE SULPICIAN METHOD.

I. *The Three Preparations.*

(*a*) The *more remote.* Removal of three obstacles in the life, *viz.* :—
  1. Abandonment of *sin.*
  2. Mortification of *the passions.*
  3. Custody of *the senses.*

(*b*) The *less remote.* Concerned with three points of time, *viz.* :—
  1. Attention to the subject overnight.
  2. Review of the subject and strict silence in the interval between this and waking in the morning.
  3. Affections of love and joy after waking and before meditation, comprising three acts: First, the putting ourselves in God's presence. Secondly, the confession of our unworthiness to appear before him. Thirdly, the confession of our incapacity to pray aright without his grace.

II. *The Body of the Prayer.*

(*a*) *Adoration*, or having *Jesus before our eyes.*—Setting Jesus before us as our example in the particular matter with which the meditation is concerned, we first consider this example briefly, then make some or all of the following offerings:—
  1. Adoration.
  2. Admiration.
  3. Praise.
  4. Love.
  5. Joy.
  6. Gratitude.

(*b*) *Communion*, or having *Jesus in the heart.*—Here we seek to gain for ourselves what we have adored and admired in our Lord. In this there are three stages :—

1. We consider the importance to us of the grace which we desire.
2. We consider how we have failed in this grace in the past, how lacking in it we are at the present, what opportunities we have for cultivating it in the future.
3. We make our petition for this grace. There are four ways of doing this :—
   By simple petition.
   By obsecration, *i.e.* pleading the merits and sufferings of our Lord, etc.
   By thanksgiving,[1] since thanksgiving for past graces is the most efficacious petition for new ones.
   By insinuation, simply stating our need, as our Lady said, "They have no wine,"[2] or the sisters of Lazarus, "Lord, he whom thou lovest is sick."[3]

(*c*) *Co-operation*, or having *Jesus in the hands.*[4]—The formation of the resolutions, which are to be :—

1. Particular.
2. Present (*i.e.*, adapted to our present need).
3. Efficacious (*i.e.*, so strongly formed as to be acted on).

III. *The Conclusion.*

This consists of :—

(*a*) Thanksgiving for graces given in the prayer.
(*b*) Contrition for faults in the prayer.
(*c*) Putting the prayer in our Lady's hands to offer to God, to supply all defects, and to obtain all blessings.
(*d*) The "spiritual nosegay," as in the Ignatian method.

(Faber, *Growth in Holiness*).

III. A METHOD OF ACTIVE CONTEMPLATION.

After a preparation as in the ordinary Ignatian method, and a like beginning, the body of the exercise is as follows :—

(*a*) *Contemplation* of the mystery chosen in detail, *viz.* :—

1. The *persons* present, visible or invisible (*e.g.* the angels), with all they represent in themselves of good or evil.

---

[1] These first three methods are deduced from Phil. iv. 6 in the Vulgate : *In omni oratione, et obsecratione, cum gratiarum actione, petitiones vestrae innotescant apud Deum.*

[2] John ii. 3.

[3] John xi. 3.

[4] St. Ambrose calls these three main divisions of the body of the prayer the three seals. The adoration is *signaculum in fronte ut semper confiteamur*, the communion, *signaculum in corde ut semper diligamus*, and the co-operation, *signaculum in brachio ut semper operemur.*

2. The *words*, either as spoken, or the interior dispositions imagined as expressed in words.
3. The *actions*, praiseworthy or blamable, ascending to the principles from which they spring.

(*b*) *Exercise of the will and affections.*—This exercise is not separated from the contemplation, but is mingled with it. At each point the soul associates itself with what it admires, and cultivates a like piety (*e.g.* with the angels it worships our Lord in the mystery, with Mary makes acts of faith, love, self-surrender, etc.), and dissociates itself from what is evil (*e.g.* contemplating the indifference of men, the malice of the Jews, the envy of the Pharisees, it falls to loving contrition for the like faults in itself and resolves on amendment). Or it contemplates our Lord as addressing it, either in words actually used by him on the occasion, or in words expressive of the dispositions of his heart. We thus get a mingling of :—

1. Considerations arising out of the contemplation.
2. Acts of the affections prompted by these considerations, with colloquies.
3. Resolutions issuing from the exercise of the intellect and the stirring of the affections.

The conclusion of the prayer may be as in the Sulpician method.

(Lehodey, *Ways of Mental Prayer.*)

A COMPARISON OF THE FOREGOING METHODS

Of the three methods outlined, the first, or Ignatian method, is undoubtedly best suited to beginners, and probably to most ordinary persons. It lays more stress than either of the two other methods on the considerations, allowing a very considerable part of the whole meditation to be devoted to them. And this exercise of the intellect on revealed truth is a very necessary element for those who are not practised in meditation and who need a good deal of preparatory machinery in order to arrive at those dispositions of the will and affection which are the chief aim of all meditation. This machinery may, at first sight, look complicated. But a little perseverance in the method reveals it as simple enough. The mind soon becomes familiar with the various stages and passes easily from one to another, finding their variety a help rather than a hindrance. Moreover, the method is capable of adaptation to the spiritual growth. Stages which at the beginning occupied a considerable part of the time allotted for the whole exercise are passed through rapidly, while the later stages, at first presenting so little possibility of development, come to occupy the greater part of the time and to develop the energies of the soul to a surprising degree. Hence many pass from the opening phases of the spiritual life to a very high degree of spirituality, knowing no other method than the Ignatian, and finding in it all that they require.

The teachers of the Sulpician method disclaim for it the name of meditation, and prefer to describe it as mental prayer. They insist strongly that the main object is to occupy, not the mind in reflection, but the affections and will in devout prayer and holy resolutions. The intellectual element is only to enter so far as it helps such prayer and resolution. Depreciated in comparison with the other elements, it is reduced to the narrowest limits. This makes the Sulpician method difficult for beginners, who need a good deal of preliminary reflection to enable them to make profitable use of the later stages, although exceptions may be found in the case of persons of intellectual capacity and a reflective disposition. Such persons, exercising their faculty of reflection on religious subjects apart from the time of the prayer, are enabled to dispense with any elaborated machinery of considerations when actually engaged in it. Others, after beginning with the Ignatian method, and continuing with it for some years, find it desirable to abandon it for the Sulpician method. As Fr. Faber has said, " the passage from meditation to affective prayer is a crisis in the spiritual life." It is the characteristic of the Sulpician method that it largely abandons meditation to concentrate on affective prayer. Persons whose development has led them to the stage when affective prayer becomes their great need will thus often find the change from the Ignatian to the Sulpician method a very real help. The latter method is especially adapted to souls which have passed from the *via purgativa* to the *via illuminativa.* Those who have passed several years in the priesthood, with religion as their constant occupation, and most of their reading of a spiritual nature, may well find that what they need in their prayer is not reflection, but the exercise of the will and affections, and that consequently the Sulpician method is best suited to them.

Of the method which we have set in the third place, a method of what is called Active Contemplation (as distinguished from Passive or Mystical Contemplation, which belongs to the realm of extraordinary prayer) little need be said here. It is akin to the Sulpician, rather than the Ignatian method. For, as Lehodey says, " it is not occupied in seeking for the truth, like meditation, it possesses it and rests in it with love." Its essence is contained in two words : " *it looks and it loves.*" This writer suggests it as a variant for the ordinary meditation when this becomes difficult, as in times of dryness, and variety is needed. For beginners it shares the disadvantages of the Sulpician mental prayer. But, here again, there are exceptional cases where it may well prove the best form of spiritual exercise for people quite inexperienced in mental prayer. Where the individual is well instructed and strong in the imaginative faculty, this method, which leaves the largest share of the work to the imagination, teaching the soul to contemplate rather than to reason, is often most profitable. We may add that it is adapted to use for a shorter period of time than the ordinary meditation. Where the Ignatian method requires the minimum of half an hour, a quarter of an hour or even ten minutes may suffice for an exercise in active contemplation. For this reason it is admirably adapted to the needs of children when they are first introduced to mental prayer, and to the requirements of quite simple folk. Children are commonly strong in the imaginative faculty, and the same trait may often be found in those simple folk who have so many of the characteristics of children. Only it must be insisted that this method requires that those who use it should be well instructed in the faith. For the imagination must exercise itself on what is revealed by God and made known to the soul, lest it become a vain imagination, constructing fictions.

ALPHABETS OF AFFECTIVE ACTS

It may be useful, by way of indicating some of the possibilities of mental prayer, to set down here the following headings of affective acts, arranged in alphabetical order, and corresponding with the three ways of the spiritual life. They are taken from the first volume of Kroust's *Meditationes ad usum clericorum* (1846), where they form part of a valuable preliminary section on the method of meditation.

ALPHABETUM AFFECTUUM PRO VIA PURGATIVA

Abjectio sui ad pedes Jesu.
Abjuratio imperfectionis.
Accusatio tui.
Admiratio patientiae divinae.
Angor de culpa.
Communicatio cum Deo.
Comparatio tui cum sanctis, damnatis, daemonibus, etc.
Confessio humilis.
Confusio tui.
Contemptus mundanorum.
Contritio.
Deprecatio.
Desiderium satisfaciendi.
Detestatio.
Diffidentia sui.
Exhortatio sui ipsius.
Exprobratio.
Fiducia.
Gratiae imploratio.
Gratitudo.
Humiliatio, et annihilatio tui.
Indignatio.
Invocatio sanctorum.
Lamentatio ad Deum, et sanctos.
Mendicatio spiritualis a Deo, et sanctis.
Odium tui, et culpae.
Pavor.
Propositum.
Querelae cum Deo, sanctis, et creaturis.
Reprehensio.
Sollicitudo.
Timor irae divinae.
Vindicta in seipsum.

ALPHABETUM AFFECTUUM PRO VIA ILLUMINATIVA

Amor proximi.
Animatio sui ad studium virtutis.
Benignitas.
Bonitas.
Contemptus mundi.
Conversatio.
Curiositas spiritualis quaerens per sanctos in caelo varia virtutis alicujus exercitia.
Eleemosyna spiritualis petita a sanctis pro se; et aliis.
Expostulatio pia cum Deo, et sanctis.
Fortitudo in adversis.
Gratiae petitio.
Gratiarum actio.
Humiliatio.
Imitandi desiderium.
Intentio gloriae Dei.
Laus sanctorum.
Longanimitas.
Mortificatio corporis.
Nitor conscientiae.
Obedientia.
Patientia.
Paupertas.
Praesentia Dei.
Suavitas.
Tranquillitas.
Veritas.
Zelus animarum.

ALPHABETUM AFFECTUUM PRO VIA UNITIVA

Amicitia cum Deo.
Amplexus Dei.
Appretiatio Dei.
Aspiratio ad Deum.
Beatitudo in Deo.
Complacentia.
Conformitas cum Deo.
Desiderium Dei.
Donatio sui Deo.
Exaltatio Dei.
Exultatio in Deo.
Filiatio ad Deum.
Fraternitas in Christo.
Gaudium in Deo.
Gloriatio in Deo, et Christo.
Imitatio Christi.
Invitatio creaturarum.
Languor animae in Deo.
Laudatio Dei.
Mors in Deo.
Narratio magnalium Dei.
Oblatio sui.
Pactum cum Deo.
Quies in Deo.
Respiratio in Deo.
Vita in Deo.
Unio in Deo.

APPENDIX II

DEVOTIONS SUGGESTED FOR THE DAYS OF THE WEEK AND THE MONTHS OF THE YEAR

DEVOTIONS SUGGESTED FOR THE DAYS OF THE WEEK

SUNDAY. The Ever–Blessed Trinity and the Eternal Father. All Saints. The Rosary : Joyful Mysteries, Advent and Christmastide : Sorrowful Mysteries, Septuagesima to end of Lent : Glorious Mysteries, Easter to end of Trinity season. Thanksgiving for God's mercies.

MONDAY. God the Son. The Holy Name. The Patron Saint. The Holy Angels. Joyful Mysteries of the Rosary. The Holy Souls.

TUESDAY. God the Holy Ghost. The Sacred Heart. The Holy Apostles. Sorrowful Mysteries of the Rosary. Prayer for Religious.

WEDNESDAY. St. Joseph. All Holy Bishops, Confessors and Doctors. Glorious Mysteries of the Rosary. Prayer for the Church, Clergy, Unity of Christendom, Missions and Church Societies.

THURSDAY. The Blessed Sacrament. The Agony in the Garden (Devotion of the Holy Hour). All Holy Matrons and Virgins. Joyful Mysteries of the Rosary. Prayer for Communicants.

FRIDAY. The Sacred Passion. The Precious Blood. The Five Wounds. The Holy Face. The Stations of the Cross. All Holy Martyrs. Sorrowful Mysteries of the Rosary. Prayer for the conversion of sinners, for the sick and dying, all sufferers.

SATURDAY. Our Lady. Glorious Mysteries of the Rosary. Prayer for a good death.

DEVOTIONS FOR THE MONTHS OF THE YEAR

JANUARY. The Sacred Infancy.
FEBRUARY. The Holy Family.
MARCH. St. Joseph.
APRIL. The Holy Ghost.
MAY. Our Lady.
JUNE. The Sacred Heart.
JULY. The Precious Blood.
AUGUST. The most pure Heart of Mary.
SEPTEMBER. Our Lady's Sorrows.
OCTOBER. The Holy Angels.
NOVEMBER. The Holy Souls.
DECEMBER. The Incarnation.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01115 3840

DATE DUE

~~MAY 1 4 '66~~
JAN 6 1998
JAN 13 1998

GAYLORD
PRINTED IN U.S.A.